Larsen, K. D., et al., (2026). *J Pub Health Issue Pract, 10*(1): 260
https://doi.org/10.33790/jphip1100260

Journal of Public Health Issues and Practices

Understanding and Reducing Faculty Burnout Through Self Efficacy Theory

Keri D. Larsen[1*], Ashley G. Bowers[2], Myia L. Graves[1], Brittany Fanguy[1], and Madeleine Bourgeois[1]
[1]*Department of Kinesiology and Health Studies, Southeastern Louisiana University, SLU Box 10845, Hammond, LA 70402, United States.*
[2] *Professor, Department of Kinesiology, Louisiana State University, 1146 Pleasant Hall, Baton Rouge, LA 70802, United States.*

Article Details
Article Type: Case Report
Received date: 18th February, 2026
Accepted date: 01st June, 2026
Published date: 03rd June, 2026

[*]**Corresponding Author:** Keri Larsen, Department of Kinesiology and Health Studies, Southeastern Louisiana University, SLU Box 10845, Hammond, LA 70402, United States.

Citation: Larsen, K. D., Bowers, A. G., Graves, M. L., Fanguy, B., & Bourgeois, M., (2026). Understanding and Reducing Faculty Burnout Through Self Efficacy Theory. *J Pub Health Issue Pract 10*(1): 260. doi: https://doi.org/10.33790/jphip1100260

Abstract

Faculty burnout in higher education is a critical institutional crisis driven by escalating workloads, administrative demands, and systemic inequities. While existing literature extensively describes these stressors, fewer frameworks explore how faculty actively mediate these pressures. This paper utilizes Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory as a central analytical framework to examine the multidimensional pathways of faculty burnout and identify targeted avenues for intervention. This paper analyzes how escalating job demands systematically erode faculty members' perceived capabilities across teaching, research, and advisory roles, with particular emphasis on how these dynamics intersect with gender and racial demographics. Shifting the focus from mere description to theory-driven action, this paper evaluates how cultivating robust professional self-efficacy serves as a vital protective buffer. Ultimately, we outline actionable, solutions-oriented institutional interventions, such as structured mentoring and workload equity metrics, designed to rebuild faculty agency and foster long-term systemic well-being.

Introduction

Burnout Syndrome is an emerging area of inquiry, especially among university faculty members. Balancing teaching, research, and administrative responsibilities requires faculty to navigate competing and often conflicting demands, where even minor disruptions can have significant consequences. Burnout among faculty members is largely driven by excessive demands, a lack of resources, institutional pressures, and personal stressors [1]. Addressing burnout requires both individual coping strategies and system reforms to ensure faculty well-being and retention. Institutions must move beyond productivity-driven models and instead foster supportive environments that prioritize mental health, work-life balance, and professional growth.

Recent empirical evidence underscores the severe scope of this national concern. A large-scale national workforce study conducted by the College and University Professional Association for Human Resources found that approximately 38% of higher education faculty members report constantly feeling emotionally exhausted, while 33% experience chronic, frequent physical exhaustion due to workplace stressors [2]. Compounding this, data indicates that the pervasive use of digital learning platforms and round-the-clock connectivity expectations have significantly intensified baseline burnout stressors across campuses [2]. Collectively, these findings highlight the urgent need for institutional policies that address workload expectations, resource allocation, and access to mental health support.

While these institutional pressures provide the external context for exhaustion, the degree to which an individual responds to burnout is often shaped by their internal beliefs in their capacity to manage such demands, a concept rooted in self-efficacy theory. This framework suggests that faculty members are not passive recipients of environmental stressors; rather, they actively mediate their workload through the lens of their own perceived competence. According to Self-Efficacy Theory, developed by Bandura [3], an individual's belief in their capacity to organize and execute actions required to manage specific situations directly dictates their coping mechanisms and vulnerability to distress. Faculty with higher levels of self-efficacy tend to demonstrate greater adaptability and persistence in the face of occupational stressors, filtering external demands into negotiable challenges rather than insurmountable threats [3, 4].

Causes and Theoretical Framework of Faculty Burnout

Some of the main contributors to faculty burnout are workload and overcommitment, administrative burdens, job insecurity, student demands, lack of autonomy, and work-life imbalance [5]. To understand why these factors lead to chronic exhaustion, they must be evaluated through the specific cognitive mechanisms of Self-Efficacy Theory. Bandura [3] identified distinct primary sources of

self-efficacy: performance accomplishments (mastery experiences), vicarious experiences, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. When academic structures undermine these sources, burnout occurs.

Workload, Overcommitment, and Administrative Burdens

Workload and overcommitment are characterized by excessive teaching, research, and service responsibilities, often compounded by increasing class sizes and additional expectations such as advising, mentoring, and committee service [1, 5]. Alongside these demands, faculty are also held strictly responsible for aggressive grant writing metrics and securing competitive external research funding [5, 6]. In tandem, the administrative burden includes aspects such as accreditation and compliance, increased assessment responsibilities, expanding institutional paperwork, and limited departmental administrative support [7].

From a theoretical standpoint, these relentless demands deny faculty the opportunity for baseline mastery experiences [3]. When a professor's time is fragmented across endless tasks, they are blocked from achieving high-quality outcomes in their core passions of teaching and research. Instead of experiencing the psychological triumph of success, they face a chronic deficit of completion, which systematically erodes their instructional and scholarly self-efficacy beliefs [4].

Job Insecurity and Student Demands

These structural pressures are further compounded by employment insecurity, particularly among adjunct faculty, who often face uncertain contracts, low pay, and a lack of benefits. Declining availability of tenure-track positions heightens anxiety regarding long-term employment, while non-tenured faculty frequently carry heavier teaching loads with reduced job security [8].

Simultaneously, faculty face rising student demands, including heightened expectations for rapid digital responsiveness and extensive individual feedback [2]. Faculty are also increasingly expected to provide support to students experiencing challenges, alongside navigating a rise in student complaints and conflicts related to grades, accommodations, and institutional policies, all of which contribute to burnout [9, 10]. This intensive socio-emotional labor forces faculty into pseudo-counseling roles for which they lack formal preparation. Under Bandura's framework, thrusting individuals into complex roles without proper organizational training creates a structural failure of performance accomplishments. This mismatch severely damages their role self-efficacy, leaving them vulnerable to distress and accelerating emotional depletion [3, 11].

Autonomy and Work-Life Imbalance

A lack of autonomy further exacerbates these pressures, as institutional policies may limit academic freedom in course design and instructional methods. Expectations to conform to rigid departmental or university-wide pedagogical standards, coupled with increased surveillance and digital monitoring, have been identified as additional drivers of faculty burnout [10]. Autonomy is a foundational prerequisite for self-efficacy; without the agency to make independent professional decisions, faculty cannot exercise the cognitive control necessary to navigate workplace challenges, resulting in a state of learned helplessness [3].

Finally, work-life imbalance represents another critical dimension of faculty burnout, as many faculty struggle to maintain boundaries between professional and personal life. Long work hours, weekend obligations, and expectations of constant availability, combined with family and caregiving responsibilities, exacerbate stress, particularly among female faculty members [12]. When professional demands spill into personal recovery time, faculty experience a continuous activation of negative physiological and emotional states, such as anxiety and chronic fatigue, which Bandura [3] noted directly signals to the individual that they lack the capability to cope, triggering a downward spiral into burnout.

Faculty burnout produces significant psychological, emotional, and physical consequences that negatively affect professional performance, personal well-being, and long-term career sustainability. Research consistently demonstrates that burnout is associated with emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, reduced personal accomplishment, and a variety of stress-related health conditions [13]. These effects not only diminish faculty effectiveness but also create a self-reinforcing cycle that further erodes self-efficacy and professional engagement.

Psychological and Physical Consequences of Faculty Burnout

Psychologically, faculty experiencing burnout often report chronic emotional exhaustion, feelings of overwhelm, increased anxiety, depressive symptoms, and a diminished sense of personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion occurs when faculty feel emotionally depleted and unable to meet the demands of teaching, research, service, and student support responsibilities [14]. As exhaustion intensifies, faculty may become increasingly detached from their work and develop negative attitudes toward students and colleagues. This depersonalization serves as a dysfunctional coping mechanism, allowing individuals to distance themselves emotionally from persistent workplace stressors [15]. Over time, these experiences contribute to a reduced sense of professional accomplishment, characterized by feelings of ineffectiveness and declining confidence in one's ability to make meaningful contributions through teaching, scholarship, and service.

From a self-efficacy perspective, reduced personal accomplishment represents the cognitive manifestation of weakened efficacy beliefs. When faculty no longer believe they can positively influence student learning, produce meaningful scholarship, or successfully navigate professional responsibilities, their motivation and performance often decline. These performance declines then reinforce negative self-perceptions, creating a destructive cycle in which diminished self-efficacy contributes to further emotional exhaustion and depersonalization [4, 15].

The consequences of burnout extend beyond psychological well-being and frequently manifest as physical health problems. Chronic stress associated with burnout has been linked to persistent fatigue, sleep disturbances, headaches, gastrointestinal issues, weakened immune functioning, and an increased risk of hypertension and cardiovascular disease [13]. Within Bandura's self-efficacy framework, these physical symptoms serve as negative physiological feedback that further undermines confidence and resilience [3]. As faculty experience ongoing exhaustion and declining health, the body communicates an inability to meet environmental demands, reinforcing perceptions of inadequacy and further weakening self-efficacy. Consequently, the psychological and physical effects of burnout operate in a reciprocal cycle that threatens both faculty well-being and professional effectiveness, underscoring the importance of interventions designed to restore efficacy, resilience, and institutional support.

Institutional and Cultural Factors of Faculty Burnout

University culture and institutional structures play a critical role in the development of faculty burnout. Unsupportive leadership, toxic work environments, and poor communication between administration and faculty contribute directly to emotional exhaustion and disengagement [1]. A lack of recognition, limited professional development opportunities, and institutional cultures that prioritize productivity over well-being further exacerbate burnout risk [16].

Additionally, the pervasive "publish or perish" culture in higher education places immense pressure on faculty to continuously produce high-impact research outputs, secure external funding, and meet aggressive performance benchmarks tied to tenure and promotion. These expectations often compel faculty to prioritize research productivity at the expense of teaching quality and personal well-being [6].

From a self-efficacy perspective, the institutional environment frequently fails to provide positive verbal persuasion (recognition, encouragement, and constructive feedback) and constructive vicarious experiences (clear, attainable models of success) [3]. When tenure expectations are ambiguous or in constant flux, faculty cannot observe successful peers to model their own behavior, undermining their confidence in achieving career advancement [9].

Differences Across Faculty Demographics and Intersectionality

Burnout does not affect all faculty equally, with notable differences based on employment status, gender, and race [17]. When analyzed through Self-Efficacy Theory, demographic disparities reveal how systemic institutional inequities selectively target and erode the self-efficacy beliefs of marginalized groups [3].

Employment Status and Contingent Labor Precarity

Non-tenure-track (NTT) and adjunct faculty face chronic job insecurity, lower compensation, limited benefits, and a lack of institutional integration. These faculty members are often assigned heavier teaching loads with minimal institutional support, creating an environment where achieving mastery experiences is structurally near impossible due to a lack of resources [18]. This systemic precarity deeply undermines their structural command over their environment, severely limiting their vicarious experiences of success and reducing baseline self-efficacy.

Gender Disparities and "Institutional Housekeeping"

Gender-based disparities are equally profound, with female faculty members consistently reporting significantly higher levels of emotional exhaustion than their male peers [12]. This disparity is largely caused by the unequal distribution of "institutional housekeeping," which includes the cumulative burden of internal institutional service responsibilities coupled with disproportionate domestic caregiving roles outside of the university [17].

Crucially, research indicates that female faculty are often assigned low-prestige, time-consuming service tasks (e.g., departmental committees, student advising) that are undervalued and not sufficiently recognized in tenure and promotion metrics [17]. This structural reality creates a severe efficacy trap: female professors exhaust their emotional energy on tasks that offer zero opportunities for recognized professional mastery accomplishments, stalling their career mobility [3].

Race, Ethnicity, and Cultural Taxation

Importantly, race functions as a distinct and heavy compounding factor in faculty burnout. Minoritized and BIPOC (Black, Indigenous, and People of Color) faculty members regularly encounter unique institutional burdens, termed "cultural taxation" the uncompensated, under-recognized expectation to serve disproportionately on diversity committees, mentor minority students, and act as institutional gatekeepers for racial equity [9]. This additional workload severely cuts into the time required for research and scholarship, directly threatening tenure metrics [9]. Furthermore, these factors create an isolating campus climate characterized by racial microaggressions, which actively depletes emotional reserves and attacks mastery expectations, accelerating burnout.

Intersectional Vulnerability

When these identities intersect, the threat to professional self-efficacy multiplies significantly. For instance, a female faculty member of color on a non-tenure-track contract stands at the intersection of systemic gender disparities, occupational instability, and cultural taxation [17]. Intersectional faculty frequently report feeling invisible in their scholarship yet hyper-visible in service obligations, facing concurrent challenges to their authority in the classroom and systemic skepticism toward their research validity from both students and peers [17].

In the language of Self-Efficacy Theory, female faculty of color face a barrage of negative verbal persuasion (microaggressions and questioning of competence) and a severe lack of vicarious experiences due to a historical deficit of women of color in senior tenured positions to serve as role models [3]. The compounding systemic demands dramatically multiply burnout vulnerability, creating severe barriers to constructing robust, protective self-efficacy beliefs.

Coping Mechanisms and Institutional Interventions

Effectively mitigating faculty burnout requires moving beyond superficial stress-management techniques and toward theory-driven strategies that restore faculty self-efficacy, agency, and professional well-being. Research suggests that both individual and institutional interventions play important roles in addressing burnout, but sustainable improvements occur when personal coping strategies are supported by meaningful organizational change [1].

At the individual level, coping mechanisms can help faculty manage stress and build resilience. Active coping strategies such as cognitive reappraisal, establishing clear boundaries between work and personal life, engaging in regular physical activity, practicing mindfulness, and seeking peer support have been associated with reduced emotional exhaustion and improved well-being [1, 14]. Among these approaches, structured faculty mentoring programs may be particularly effective because they directly strengthen self-efficacy. Through vicarious experiences, junior faculty observe successful colleagues navigating the demands of teaching, research, service, and work-life balance, providing realistic models for success [19]. Mentorship also offers verbal persuasion through encouragement, feedback, and professional guidance, reinforcing confidence in one's abilities and counteracting feelings of inadequacy that often accompany burnout [3].

While individual strategies are valuable, they cannot fully address the systemic factors that contribute to faculty burnout. Consequently, meaningful mitigation requires institutional interventions that reduce organizational stressors and support faculty success. Universities can promote faculty well-being by balancing teaching, research, and service expectations; establishing transparent and equitable promotion and tenure processes; providing access to mental health resources; and fostering cultures of recognition and support. Leadership initiatives that prioritize faculty well-being over purely transactional productivity metrics are associated with lower burnout rates and improved job satisfaction [20]. Additionally, policies that provide flexible work arrangements, hybrid teaching options, family leave, and workload accommodations help faculty manage competing professional and personal responsibilities while maintaining a sense of control over their work [12, 20].

Ultimately, the most effective approach to reducing faculty burnout integrates individual resilience-building strategies with institutional reforms designed to strengthen self-efficacy and restore professional agency. By combining personal support systems with organizational structures that promote fairness, flexibility, and recognition, higher education institutions can create environments that foster long-term faculty health, engagement, and retention.

Creating Supportive Environments for Faculty Success

To effectively rebuild faculty self-efficacy and reduce burnout, institutions must move beyond individual resilience initiatives and implement meaningful structural support. One critical .,.kjb strategy is the development of workload equity metrics that quantify, recognize, and reward often overlooked responsibilities such as mentoring, advising, and diversity-related service. By formally acknowledging these contributions in promotion and tenure processes, institutions can provide faculty, particularly women and underrepresented minority faculty, with recognized mastery experiences that reinforce professional competence and value [17]. Universities should also

invest in targeted professional development that equips faculty with the skills necessary to navigate increasingly complex roles, including intensive student advising and mental health support.

Providing practical training and resources can transform potentially overwhelming responsibilities into opportunities for successful performance and enhanced role efficacy [11]. Additionally, transparent evaluation frameworks are essential for fostering self-efficacy. Clearly defined and stable promotion and tenure criteria reduce uncertainty and stress while providing faculty with a clear pathway toward professional achievement and mastery [19]. Collectively, these institutional strategies create an environment where faculty can develop confidence in their abilities, experience greater professional satisfaction, and sustain long-term engagement in their careers. Ultimately, personal resilience efforts are most effective when supported by responsive organizational structures, highlighting the importance of an integrated approach to promoting faculty well-being, reducing burnout, and improving faculty retention [1].

Conclusion

Faculty burnout is not an individual psychological failure, but a predictable systemic crisis fueled by shifting institutional paradigms and compounding socio-emotional expectations. As demonstrated through Self-Efficacy Theory, a faculty member's internal belief in their professional capacity serves as the crucial defensive bulkhead against chronic exhaustion. However, this internal belief structure cannot be sustained in an unsupportive environment. Demographics particularly the intersection of gender and race dictate how heavily external institutional loads erode personal agency. To ensure long-term faculty retention and protect holistic well-being, higher education institutions must pivot away from transactional productivity metrics and invest in structural, solutions-oriented interventions that actively build, protect, and restore faculty self-efficacy.

Conflicts of Interest: The author reports there are no competing interests to declare.

References

1. Sabagh, Z., Hall, N. C., & Saroyan, A. (2018). Antecedents, correlates, and consequences of faculty burnout. *Educational Research, 60*(2), 131–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2018.1461573
2. Frazier, T., & Woods, C. (2024). The state of the higher education workforce: Faculty survey report. College and University Professional Association for Human Resources (CUPA-HR). Research Report.
3. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84*(2), 191–215. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191
4. Hall, N. C., Goetz, T., & Stupnisky, R. H. (2019). Self-efficacy, procrastination, and burnout in post-secondary faculty: An international longitudinal analysis. *PLoS ONE, 14*(12), e0223815. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223815
5. de Aguiar Bandeira, M., Rodeghiero Neto, I., Franz, L. A. S., Bemvenuti, R. H., & Bolzan, L. M. (2026). Determinants of burnout in higher education professors: a systematic literature review. *International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, 32*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/10803548.2026.2618929
6. Shin, J. C., & Jung, J. (2014). Academics' job satisfaction and job stress across countries in the changing academic environments. *Higher Education, 67*(5), 603–620. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-013-9668-y
7. Koster, M., & McHenry, K. (2023). Areas of work-life that contribute to burnout among higher education health science faculty and perception of institutional support. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-Being, 18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/17482631.2023.2235129
8. Reevy, G. M., & Deason, G. (2014). Predictors of depression, stress, and anxiety among non-tenure track faculty. *Frontiers in Psychology, 5*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00701
9. Bello, S. A., Azubuike, F. C., & Akande, O. A. (2023). Reputation disparity in teaching and research productivity and rewards in the context of consequences of institutionalization of Publish or Perish culture in academia. *Higher Education Quarterly, 77*(3), 574–584. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12417
10. Hammoudi Halat, D., Soltani, A., Dalli, R., Alsarraj, L., & Malki, A. (2023). Understanding and fostering mental health and well-being among university faculty: A narrative review. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 12*(13), 4425. https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12134425
11. Padilla, M. A., & Thompson, G. (2016). Burnout, self-efficacy, and coping strategies among college faculty. *Journal of Higher Education Management, 31*(1), 4–16.
12. Sharafizad F. (2025). If you're doing this correctly, there is a cost: An exploration of the work–family trade-offs of female academics in Australia. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-09-2024-0532
13. Salvagioni, D. A. J., Melanda, F. N., Mesas, A. E., González, A. D., Gabani, F. L., & Andrade, S. M. (2017). Physical, psychological and occupational consequences of job burnout: A systematic review of prospective studies. *PLoS ONE, 12*(10), e0185781. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0185781
14. Springer, A., Oleksa-Marewska, K., Basińska-Zych, A., Werner, I., & Białowąs, S. (2023). Occupational burnout and chronic fatigue in the work of academic teachers–moderating role of selected health behaviours. *PLoS ONE, 18*(1), e0280080. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280080
15. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Burnout. In G. Fink (Ed.), Stress: Concepts, cognition, emotion, and behavior (pp. 351–357). *Academic Press*. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-800951-2.00044-3
16. Cadena-Povea, H., Hernández-Martínez, M., Bastidas-Amador, G., & Torres-Andrade, H. (2025). What pushes university professors to burnout? A systematic review of sociodemographic and psychosocial determinants. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 22*(8), 1214. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph22081214
17. O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., & Nyunt, G. (2017). Constrained Choices: A View of Campus Service Inequality From Annual Faculty Reports. *The Journal of Higher Education, 88*(5), 672–700. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1257312
18. Kezar, A., DePaola, T., & Scott, D. T. (2019). The gig academy: Mapping labor in the neo-liberal university. Johns Hopkins University Press.
19. Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2007). The differential antecedents of self-efficacy beliefs of novice and experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(6), 944–956. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.05.003
20. Kinman, G., & Johnson, S. (2019). Special section on well-being in academic employees. *International Journal of Stress Management, 26*(2), 159–161.