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Abstract

This study focuses on academics engagement and burnout in British Universities. There is a growing concern about academic staff and their performance in their roles and the effects it is having on stress levels. As part of the government spending cuts in 2010, higher education institutions in England had their teaching budgets cut by 40%. A rise in tuition fees to £9,000 also resulted in many institutions having to make teaching and support staff redundant (Graduate Prospects 2014). These changes to the funding of Universities have had a major impact on the sector, forcing Universities to compete in terms of teaching standards, research income (hefce, 2014) and professionalization of academic staff through the implementation of the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) (HE Academy, 2014) and raising entry qualifications to Doctorate level. Academic staff in British Universities have higher psychological distress when compared to academics in other countries (Kinman & Jones, 2003). This paper explores the relationship between the demands and resources of the academic role and engagement and burnout. This review concludes by posing the research question of what is the mix and interplay of job demands and job resources that will engender engaged University academic staff in Britain.

Introduction

This paper is part of a Doctoral thesis researching how job demands and job resources of British University academic staff relate to burn-out and engagement. The aim of this paper is to review the literature and pose the research question. This concept has been widely researched in different sectors e.g. cabin crew in an airline in Taiwan (Chen and Chen, 2012), South African primary school educators (Montgomery et al, 2005) Australasian police officers (Lynch, 2007) but not so much for academic staff. Exceptions to this are the work of: Gillespie et al (2001), on Australian academics undergoing large-scale change and the resultant increases in stress; Kinman & Jones (2003) on increasing stressors on academics and declining job satisfaction; Boyd et al., (2011) on how job demands and resources predict psychological strain and commitment in Australian University academics; and Mark and Smith (2012) on the effects of occupational stress and job characteristics on job satisfaction of university employees.

In this paper, the contribution of the Job- Demand-Resources Model (J-DR) (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007), the model most widely used to explain engagement is reviewed and applied to the working life of an academic and other professional occupations. Earlier occupational stress theories and models are also reviewed: the Demand-Control Model (DC) (Karasek, 1979); the Demand-Control Support Model (DCS) (Johnson & Hall, 1988) and the Effort-Reward Imbalance Model (ERI) (Siegrist, 1996).

Relevant studies from Britain and other countries which consider job characteristics and stress are explained. The emergent factors are then considered in the light of academic job characteristics and engagement and a possible research question is posed.
Changing academic climate

For years now, higher education has been at the centre of government reforms resulting in many changes. In 2003, Kinman and Jones (2003) commented on the move to mass education not being accompanied by a corresponding increase in resources. These reforms have demanded greater accountability for standards and efficiency which has resulted in many cases in more centralised systems (Kinman and Jones, 2003).

Academics in Britain and in other countries have experienced intense changes in their work environment. Student numbers have grown, resources have declined whilst at the same time more focus has been placed on quality assurance and accountability, as well as a stronger pressure on research output and generating research funding (Darmody & Smyth, 2008; Lacy & Sheehan, 1997; O'Connell et al., 2006; Scheutze & Slowey, 2002; Winefield et al., 2003). More of the course and module administration and use of technology enhanced learning is also expected and delivery of courses in different modes to a wider variety of student populations (Brewer & McMahon, 2003; Doyle & Hind, 1998; Winter et al., 2000).

Since 1965, student numbers have increased from 400,000 to over 1,800,000 (Higher Education Statistics Agency, 2000). “The number of HE students studying at UK HEIs had gradually increased from 2007/08 to 2010/11, however this number fell slightly in 2011/12. Overall since 2007/08 the percentage change was 8.3%, and since 2010/11 the percentage change was -0.2%” (HESA, 2014). Over the past three decades, the student: staff ratio (SSR) in UK higher education has increased from 9 students to 1 teacher, to 19 students to 1 teacher. This is a rise of more than 100% (UCU, 2014). A very recent study explains the effect of the changing climates within UK research-intensive Universities (Schulz, 2013). He identified a number of climates within the Universities which he named the Clan, the Hierarchy, the Adhocracy and the Market and these climates had different effects on academic staff (Schulz 2013).

“The market approach put an academic’s roles in competition – creating conflict. An Adhocracy climate gave individuals control by giving them autonomy – reducing conflict and ambiguity. The Hierarchy climate created clarity, the Clan climate gave individuals control by allowing them to participate in management – reducing conflict and creating clarity – and, finally, academics found the Clan climate intrinsically satisfying by creating a supportive environment” (Schulz, 2013 p477).

A concern raised by this researcher is that the Market climate is associated with higher role conflict but seems to be the one that is on the increase bearing in mind the changes referred to earlier through Government intervention and demand for increases in standards coupled with a decline in the more supportive Clan climate. All of these changes are likely to have introduced more burnout than engagement for academics, which needs to be further explored.

Employee Engagement, Burn-out and the Job-Demand Resources Model

Employee Engagement and Burnout

Employee engagement is a concept that is gathering momentum in business and academic study. This concept appeared in the 1990s and since then over 200 scientific publications have appeared on the subject (Schaufeli, 2012). According to Purcell (2012 p15) “Employee engagement is worth pursuing, not as an end in itself, but as a means of improving working lives and company performance”. “Work engagement represents the result of positive psychological processes and is understood as optimistic feelings and fulfilment from work” (Chen & Chen, 2012 p43). Kahn (1990 p694) was an early ethnographic researcher who described the concept of engagement as the “…harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles: in engagement people employ and express themselves physically,
cognitively, emotionally and mentally during role performances”. He considered the positive outcomes to have an effect at the individual and organisational level.

Burnout has 3 frequently researched dimensions referred to by Abenavoli et al., (2013) in their study of the effect of mindfulness against burnout amongst school teachers and these dimensions are widely accepted as they form the basis of the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) (Maslach et al., 1997) used to measure burnout. These are emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation and low personal accomplishment.

Burnout has been linked to poorer physiological and psychosocial health and well-being with school teachers (Bellingrath et al., 2009). Previous research on teachers has indicated that those who experience more stress (McCormick & Barnett, 2011) or show more commitment to their work, report more burnout (Klusmann et al., 2008; Maslach et al 2001). Burnout can be considered as an opposite concept to engagement (Schaufeli, 2012). Employee engagement and burnout can be seen as opposite ends of a continuum. Employee engagement is a result of “positive psychological processes” (Chen & Chen, 2012 p43) whereas burnout “a reaction to chronic occupational stress, characterized by emotional exhaustion, cynicism and inefficacy” (Chen & Chen, 2012 p43). If engagement and burnout are inextricably linked, then they can be measured by the same instrument (Schaufeli, 2012).

Other theorists see engagement as a concept in its own right which is negatively related to burnout. It can be defined as a work related state of mind “characterised by vigor, dedication and absorption” (Schaufeli et al., 2002 p 74). So it is about energy, persistence and eagerness and being engrossed in ones work. Kahn (1990) saw the source of engagement as the work role whereas if employee engagement and burnout are opposite ends of a continuum, the source would be the work itself. For businesses the source is seen as the organisation. Macey & Schneider (2008 p4) tried to bring together the academic and business views into a general definition “...a desirable condition (that) has an organisational purpose, and connotes involvement, commitment, passion, enthusiasm, focused effort and energy”.

**Job-Demands Resources Model**

Many studies have shown that job characteristics can have a far reaching effect on employee well-being e.g. job demands such as high work pressure, emotional demands and role ambiguity may lead to sleeping problems, exhaustion and impaired health (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Beehr et al., 2001). On the other hand, job resources such as social support, performance feedback and autonomy may incite a motivational process resulting in job related learning, work engagement and organisational commitment (Demerouti et al., 2001; Salanova et al., 2005; Taris & Feij, 2004).

*The Job Demand-Resources (JD-R) model was introduced by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) who built on the previous occupational stress models such as the Demand-Control Model (DC) (Karasek, 1979); the Demand-Control Support Model (DCS) (Johnson & Hall, 1988) and the Effort-Reward Imbalance Model (ERI) (Siegrist, 1996).*

The Demand-Control Support Model (Karasek & Thorell, 1990) predicts that high levels of job demands, low levels of job control, and low levels of social support are strongly associated with negative health outcomes. A basic premise of the DC and the DCS Models is that if the job holder can decide how to meet job demands, they will not experience job strain since they can exercise control over decisions. The DCS Model (Johnson & Hall 1988) says that strain will be greater where support is also low. On the contrary, where support and
control are high and demands are high, work is challenging and this results in motivation and active learning. (Taris & Schreurs, 2009).

The Effort Reward Imbalance Model (ERI Siegrist, 1996) predicts that high levels of extrinsic and intrinsic effort and low levels of reward significantly predict negative health outcomes. It accentuates the reward more than the control structure of work. The ERI-model claims that job strain results from an imbalance between effort (extrinsic job demands and intrinsic motivation to meet the demands) and reward (salary, esteem, security, promotion). Therefore, where effort is not reciprocated by reward, it leads to arousal and stress and physical illness. This model has a personal element – over commitment. This refers to a set of attitudes, behaviours and emotions which reflect excessive striving coupled with a strong desire for approval and esteem.

The authors of the Job-Demands Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) criticise these previous models on the grounds that they are restricted by a limited set of predictor variables which may not be relevant for all types of job roles. They also consider that the static character of these models being restricted to autonomy (DC); social support (DCS) and reward (ERI) may not fit all job situations.

The Job-Demands Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) is distinguished because it takes account of different jobs having different risk factors associated with job stress. These are classified into job demands and job resources:

“Job demands refer to psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort or skills and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs. Examples are a high work pressure, an unfavorable physical environment, and emotionally demanding interactions with clients.” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007 p312). Job demands are not always negative, but can become so where high effort is required when the employee does not necessarily have the capacity at the time it is required.

“Job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social, or organizational aspects of the job that are either/or:

- Functional in achieving work goals.
- Reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs.
- Stimulate personal growth, learning, and development.” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007 p312).

Job resources may be located at the level of the organization, the team, the individual and task level and include remuneration, career paths, social relations, supervisor –team relations, clarity of job definition, consultation and collaboration and at the level of the task, job enrichment factors.

The generic nature of the JD-R Model means that it can be tailored when used with particular occupational groups such as academic staff. This also explains why this model has been so widely used in various occupational environments for e.g. cabin crew in an airline in Taiwan (Chen and Chen, 2012); South African primary school educators (Montgomery et al., 2005); and Australasian police officers (Lynch, 2007). It can, therefore be easily applied within an academic context.
The JD-R Model links job demands to the potential for burnout and job resources as a means of engaging employees. These two different fundamental psychological processes affect job strain and motivation. Firstly, poorly designed jobs or chronic job demands exhaust employees’ mental and physical resources. In an attempt to protect performance, individuals undergo biological changes (Hockey, 1993) which eventually lead to a draining of energy ending in breakdown;

Secondly, job resources have the potential to motivate, produce high work engagement, low cynicism and excellent performance. This occurs on an intrinsic level as growth and learning and development; or extrinsic in terms of achieving goals. It follows therefore that job resources fulfil human needs of autonomy (de Charms, 1968), competence (White, 1959) and relatedness (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Supportive colleagues and proper feedback from managers increase the likelihood of work goals being achieved (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007).

The following studies demonstrate evidence of this dual process:

- Call centre, Dutch telecom company (Bakker et al., 2003a). Showed effects on absenteeism & turnover
- Nutrition production workers used the model to predict future absenteeism (Bakker et al., 2003b)

The J-DR model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) claimed that job resources may buffer the impact of job demands on job strain including burnout (Bakker et al., 2003). These resources may vary according to the particular job characteristics and subsequent job strain. Kahn & Byosserie (1992) say that this buffering effect is affected by both the individual characteristics of the job holder and the work situation. Social support (Haines et al., 1991), predictability and controllability of a stressor and understanding why it is present (Kahn & Byosserie, 1992) can all act as buffers. The following studies demonstrate evidence of buffer effect of job resources:

- A large institute for Higher Education (Bakker et al., 2005) found that high demands and low job resources added to the prediction of burnout. Specifically, “work overload, emotional demands, physical demands and work-home interference did not result in burnout if employees experienced autonomy, received feedback, had social support or had a high-quality relationship with supervisor” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007 p317);
- Employees from two home care organisations (Xanthopoulou et al., 2006) found similar results;
- Public sector dentists in Finland (Hakanen et al., 2005). The hypothesis was that job resources (e.g variability in required professional skills and peer contacts) are most beneficial in maintaining work engagement when high job demands (e.g. unfavourable physical conditions and workload) are present;
- Comparable findings were made in a study of Finnish teachers (Bakker et al., 2006). Job resources act as buffers and reduce the negative effect of pupil misbehaviour and engagement. “Supervisor support, innovativeness, appreciation, and organisational climate were important job resources for teachers that helped them cope with demanding interactions with students” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007 p319)

Therefore, a final proposition of the J-DR model is that job resources have a key role when job demands are high. A greater pool of resources means individuals are less susceptible to resource loss (Hobfoll & Shirom, 2000).

However, although there is a lot of support for the dual processes presented by the J-DR model, some studies have evidenced the role of resources not only in the motivational process but in the process of burn-out as well. Therefore, where job resources such as social support and feedback and supervisory coaching (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) are
lacking, burn-out can be predicted. A further study showed this to be the case where a lack of control over work tasks, supervisor support, information, social climate and innovative climate (Hakanen et al., 2005; Bakker & Shaufeli, 2006) also demonstrated the role of resources linked to burn-out. An explanation proposed by Boyd et al. (2010) is that energy is reduced by excessive demands and reduced relevant resources so that individuals draw deeper to a personal reservoir of resources ultimately leading to burn-out.

To summarise, occupational stress models agree that job characteristics can have a powerful effect on an individual's well-being and stress levels. Where a job role is ambiguous, has a lot of pressure and demands a lot of emotional energy, it could lead the job holder to symptoms of stress. (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004; Beehr et al., 2001). However, when a job role holder receives social support and feedback regarding performance and can exercise autonomy, this may lead to positive enthusiasm and commitment and a sense of development on the part of the job holder (Johnson & Hall, 1988; Siegrist, 1996). The above mentioned positive aspects are referred to as job resources and the negative aspects as demands.

The latest model, the Job-Demand Resources Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) generalises demands into individual, team and organisational aspects of the job that require sustained effort and skills associated with “physiological and/or psychological costs” (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007 p312); and job resources can be physical as well as individual, team and organisational which help goal achievement; reduce the physiological or psychological cost of job demands and stimulate personal development. The studies previously described illustrate the powerful role that resources play in achieving employee engagement through intrinsic growth and extrinsic goal achievement (Siegrist, 1996). Resources are key in their own right as well as in relation to demands. Where resources are lacking, burnout can be predicted and resources can mediate the effect of high job demands (Hakanen et al., 2005; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). There is also some evidence of resources being linked to burnout where high demands cause individuals to tap into personal reserves of energy and burn themselves out. (Boyd et al., 2011). Due to the limitations explained of the earlier models, it would seem appropriate to use the J-DR model to explore the changing academic work role.

Empirical studies of work stress in British Universities

This section focuses more on studies looking into stress of academic staff presented in chronological order. Doyle and Hind (1998) reported that heavy workload, lack of time to keep up to date and job interfering with personal life were among the top 10 stressors found. They also found high levels of burnout amongst UK academics.

Kinman and Jones (2003) suggest that teaching and researching in UK universities has become comparatively stressful and unsatisfying to the point of distress. In their research they identified several factors affecting stress levels. The factors most relevant to this paper are Factor 2: professional constraints; Factor 4: time demands; Factor 6: professional demands; Factor 7: professional supports. In summary, these factors included increasing expectations around excellence in teaching, administration and research and an increasing pressure to publish. Lack of training opportunities were highlighted, a third of respondents indicating that they felt ill equipped to carry out an increasing range of tasks and yet the respondents perceived that the organisation did not value quality. 80% of respondents felt that professional demands had increased over the last 5 years and that there was too much administrative paperwork with fewer resources available to cope with the demands. There was also a general perception that bureaucracy had increased, more rules, more meetings and unnecessary tasks to complete. Managers were criticised as ill matched or not developed enough to do the role well, although some respondents felt managers were also
over stretched and were doing the best they could. About half the respondents did not feel valued. The stressor with the strongest relationship with job satisfaction was 'professional constraints'. This constraint is linked to opportunities for promotion and advancement and training and development.

One lecturer commented “research is serious, teaching is serious, administration is serious; they are three jobs in one” (Kinman & Jones, 2003 p35). Alongside this, respondents did not feel well supported or well resourced. Kinman & Jones (2003) quote from Cross & Carroll (1990) stating that almost 50% of academics from 7 British Universities said they found their jobs stressful most of the time.

A study carried out by Mark & Smith (2012) in Cardiff University concludes that academic staff suffer from high levels of anxiety, depression and stress related illnesses compared to the general population. It supports the previously researched strong relationships between efforts, demands, control, supports and rewards and depression, anxiety and job satisfaction and also between coping and attributional style, and these outcomes.

The level and factors linked to job satisfaction among accounting and finance academics in Ireland has been explored by Bryne (2012). Although, participants were generally satisfied with most aspects of their jobs, they were dissatisfied with promotion prospects and time available for research. Hours of work and relationship with the department head were the strongest predictors of academic staffs’ overall job satisfaction.

Most recently, Schulz (2013) studied the perceptions of organisational climate, role ambiguity and role conflict and the effect on job satisfaction of academics in research-intensive UK universities. His findings mainly focus on organisational climate as mentioned earlier in this paper. The collegial climate or Clan climate makes an important contribution to academic staff satisfaction and Shultz’s work claims that it is declining due to the market driven policies now in place following the Higher Education White Paper (hefce 2014).

Other than the above mentioned studies which focus on stress and job satisfaction, no other studies have been found which look into job demands and resources and engagement and burnout of British academics in Higher Education. The major changes in Government policy are, arguably, causing a crisis point for British academics. Most of the above studies have been carried out prior to these Government led changes which makes this study worthy of investigation.

Empirical studies in Universities in other countries

The following studies have linked job stresses to time and resource constraints in American academics (Blix et al.,1994); stress resulting from large -scale change in Australian academics (Gillespie et al., 2001); examined sources of stress and related it to well-being in a Canadian University (Biron et al., 2008); and used the Job-Demand Resources Model to study engagement and burnout in Australian academics (Boyd et al., 2011); and are presented in chronological order.

In 1994, Blix et al (1994) reported that of the 400 academics from a university in the United States, 66% of them perceived severe levels of stress at work at least half of the time. These stress levels related to shortage of resources or time constraints.
Gillespie et al. (2001), studied Australian academics undergoing large-scale change not dissimilar from the changes following recent Government funding cuts in Britain. This was a longitudinal study of academic and general staff looking at sources, perceptions, consequences and moderators of stress. Academic staff reported higher levels of stress than general staff. Five major sources of stress were identified including: insufficient funding and resources; work overload; poor management practice; job insecurity; and insufficient recognition and reward.

Biron et al. (2008) carried out the first study in Canada of an entire staff of a University on the extent and sources of occupational stress. Their research concurs with the studies previously discussed in terms of the changes in the HE sector and the effects on staff. High levels of psychological stress were found which were significantly related to other well-being indicators like job satisfaction, turnover intentions, physical health and emotional exhaustion. Some organisational risk factors were reported as high risk to health: quantitative overload; unsatisfactory and discordant relationships with one’s manager and low participation in decision-making.

During this study qualitative data was also gathered. This provided a list of organisational and managerial practices in relation to each high risk factor as follows:

- work overload – no procedure to assess systematically either employees or their tasks as this was abandoned by managers due to time constraints.
- no standard on teaching load (e.g., courses, supervision of students, participation in thesis committees), group size, or the number of students to be supervised.
- Work conditions are not specified in the work contract and informal rules prevail and much of the workload is negotiated or discretionary.
- Respondents indicated that managers lacked human resource management skills and were not trained in them after hiring. Their performance was not assessed and managed. Managers also seemed to have little time to devote to relationships with their staff.
- Data gathered indicated limited participation in decision-making by the staff and the organisation appeared to function reactively. Discussion in teams was limited due to lack of team meetings

This study concluded that the current HRM strategies in the University were insufficient to ensure the psychological well-being of many of the employees. They recommended a re-examination of management practices and that these practices should evolve from “the management of human resources” to “human management of resources” (Biron et al., 2008 p520). Since staff costs make up a high proportion of any University budget and if the staff are suffering from occupational stress and its consequences such as absenteeism and exhaustion, University HR functions need to be interested and equipped to tackle the problem.

A study of academics across 12 Australian Universities (Boyd et al., 2011) looked at how job demands, which they defined as work pressure and academic workload, and job resources such as procedural fairness and job autonomy “would predict psychological strain and organisational commitment over a three year period” (Boyd et al., 2011 p112). More specifically this study considered the antecedents of psychological strain and organisational commitment, the first of its kind to use a longitudinal design, rather than a cross sectional design. The study applies the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Demerouti et al., 2001), widely used to investigate engagement and burnout. The results of this study emphasise the importance of two job resources: procedural fairness and autonomy, related to well-being of Australian academics. In the past, these resources have been linked to two different schools of thought i.e. procedural fairness with social exchange theory (Blau, 1964).
and autonomy with demand-control theory (Karasek, 1979) but this study claims that “the two constructs are conceptually and empirically linked” (Boyd et al., 2011 p132). In other words, procedural justice may be viewed as a mechanism for safeguarding autonomy, particularly during times of change.

Boyd et al., (2011) recommend for future studies to shift the focus away from the individual’s intrinsic attachment to the job to how valued the person feels by the organisation. A further proposal from this study is that belongingness may be an important intercessor of the resources-commitment relationship. The results of this study suggested that robust HR processes; good communication and consultation, regarding changes; and enabling the autonomy of academics regarding initiative and decision-making, can minimise psychological strain and increase organisational commitment. In order for the above to be implemented it is suggested that managers will require training and HR functions to be well resourced.

The results of this Australian study are consistent with earlier studies linking job demands to psychological strain in academic staff (Kinman, 2001). However, in addition, the study found a relationship that mediated demands, resources and strain. This finding suggests that perceived high workload and work pressure at Time 1 fuels a sense of injustice and erodes perceptions of autonomy (also at Time 1), leading, over time, to increased psychological strain. Kinman (2001) encourages further research in this area and indicates a link to a study by Karasek and Theorell’s (1990). Their work demand-control-support model of stress suggests that control moderates the relationship between demands and strain. In the Kinman study, control in the form of autonomy, and fairness of procedures, mediates this relationship. Kinman (2001) advocates further research to explore the mediated, versus moderated, nature of these relationships.

In considering reversed causal effects Kinman (2001) found no link between current psychological strain and commitment to future perceptions of work resources and work demands. However, this may be due to a three year time lapse in this longitudinal study whereas a shorter time period may yield different results.

In conclusion, the above studies provide plenty of evidence of how many academic staff are suffering from stress and/or perceive that their jobs have become more stressful. This is reinforced by the changes in education which have resulted in new expectations being imposed from Government agencies (hefce, 2014). In the studies reviewed in this paper, factors related to stress have emerged in the non-academic and academic studies which do overlap. For example: work overload (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker, 2005; Doyle & Hind, 1998; Gillespie et al., 2001; Biron, 2008; Boyd, 2011); relationship to supervisor (Bakker et al., 2006; Byrne, 2012; Gillespie et al., 2001); and autonomy/control (Kahn & Byosserie, 1992; Boyd, 2011) are important in alleviating stress. Other factors relevant in the studies outside the University sector are supportive colleagues (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Haines et al., 1991; Hakanen et al., 2005) whereas the academic studies seem to emphasise lack of time to do research and keep updated (Doyle & Hind, 1998; Kinman & Jones, 2003), lack of reward and recognition Kinman & Jones, 2003, Byrne, 2012; Gillespie et al., 2001); and a lack of a good HR function (Biron, 2008; Boyd, 2011) as causing staff to feel more stressed. Further exploration of the relevant factors in the Universities in Britain will be useful to add to the limited number of studies carried out to date on this pressing issue.

Conclusion
The research question being considered in this literature review is how do job demands and job resources relate to burnout and engagement for British University academic staff. Few British studies have been carried out on engagement of academic staff and none of them have used the J-DR Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). The J-DR Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) due to its generic nature can be used with different occupations and this
review has provided evidence of a changing climate and increased strain on academic staff which would make it worthy of investigation with British academics. A longitudinal, qualitative study would certainly add to this body of knowledge and assist British Universities to increase engagement and reduce the stress levels of their staff. Learning from Boyd et al (2011) who advised against a 3 year time lapse, this study will be based on a one year time lapse longitudinal study. This could be a timely study in view of recent changes to the Education sector in Britain. This literature review has raised the question of what is the mix and interplay of job demands and job resources that will engender engaged University academic staff in Britain.
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