FUTURITY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE

DOI: https://doi.org/10.57125/FS.2026.06.20.09

How to cite: Milcu, M. (2026). From digital fatigue to technological burnout: Assessment challenges and implications for psychological practice. A critical overview. *Futurity of Social Sciences, 4*(2), 174–197. https://doi.org/10.57125/FS.2026.06.20.09

From Digital Fatigue to Technological Burnout: Assessment Challenges and Implications for Psychological Practice. A Critical Overview

Marius Milcu

Associate Professor, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, Sibiu, Romania,

https://orcid.org/0009-0008-0697-9404

***Correspondence email:** *marius.milcu@ulbsibiu.ro.*

Received: March 9, 2026 | **Accepted:** May 12, 2026 | **Published:** June 14, 2026

Abstract: The proliferation of digital technologies has introduced a new cluster of occupational and psychological phenomena that challenge both theoretical frameworks and clinical assessment tools, and that can be understood as part of a broader social transformation in how intellectual work is organized. This article provides a theoretical review examining the conceptual continuum from digital fatigue through technostress to full technological burnout, with particular attention to the assessment landscape and its limitations. Drawing on empirical literature from occupational psychology, cognitive neuroscience, and behavioral therapy, the article analyses the principal measurement instruments currently available – including the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), the Technostress Creators Scale, the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire–II (AAQ-II), the General

Procrastination Scale (GPS), the Recovery Experience Questionnaire (REQ), and the NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX) — and critically evaluates their applicability, psychometric properties, and theoretical coherence within digital work contexts. Five primary assessment challenges are identified: construct overlap, ecological validity deficits, the absence of technology-specific normative data, state-versus-trait ambiguity, and comorbidity with common psychopathological conditions. The article concludes with expanded practical implications for psychologists working with intellectually intensive occupational populations, including a proposed integrative assessment protocol, case conceptualization guidelines, phased intervention recommendations, psychoeducational strategies, organizational-level approaches, and ethical considerations related to digital monitoring.

Keywords: ACT, digital fatigue, experiential avoidance, Job Demands-Resources model, occupational psychology, procrastination, psychological assessment, recovery, technological burnout, technostress

Introduction

The twenty-first-century workplace has undergone a structural transformation whose psychological consequences are only beginning to be systematically understood. The near-universal integration of digital technology into professional life has created working conditions in which the computer is simultaneously the primary tool of production, the medium of communication, and the surface upon which intellectual effort is expended. For populations engaged in sustained intellectual work (researchers, clinicians, academics, writers, analysts), this tripartite function of digital devices creates conditions of chronic cognitive loading that classical occupational stress models were not designed to capture (Tarafdar et al., 2007). Far from being a narrowly clinical concern, the spread of technology-related exhaustion is a broad social transformation phenomenon: it reshapes the boundaries between labor and rest, alters the temporal rhythms of professional life, and redistributes well-being across an increasingly digitalized workforce.

Research Problem

Psychological literature has responded to this reality with a proliferation of overlapping constructs: digital fatigue, screen fatigue, technostress, technology-related burnout, and cyber-exhaustion, among others. While this conceptual abundance reflects a genuine attempt to characterize the diversity of technology-related distress, it has also created significant theoretical and diagnostic ambiguity. Clinicians face the practical problem of selecting from a growing menu of assessment instruments (many of which were developed for general occupational populations) and applying them to individuals whose complaints are specific, technology-mediated, and functionally distinct from traditional occupational burnout. The core problem this article addresses is therefore the mismatch between an expanding but fragmented vocabulary of technology-related distress and an assessment toolkit that lacks technology-specific coherence, normative grounding, and differential-diagnostic resolution.

Research Focus

The article focuses on the conceptual continuum running from digital fatigue through technostress to fully established technological burnout, and on the instruments used to assess each construct in digitally intensive work environments. Particular attention is given to the psychometric properties, theoretical coherence, and ecological validity of the principal measures, and to the diagnostic challenges that arise when these instruments are applied to intellectually intensive occupational populations whose relationship to technology differs structurally from that of the corporate end-users for whom many instruments were originally normed.

Research Aim and Questions

This article aims to provide a theoretically grounded, critically appraised synthesis of the digital fatigue–burnout continuum and its assessment, and to derive expanded practical implications for psychological assessment and intervention. Three interrelated questions guide the review: (1) How can the principal constructs in the digital fatigue–burnout continuum be theoretically differentiated? (2) How adequate are the instruments currently available for their assessment, in terms of psychometric quality, normative grounding, and ecological validity? (3) What assessment protocols and intervention frameworks follow from this appraisal for clinical and occupational practice?

Conceptual Framework: A Continuum of Digital Exhaustion

Digital Fatigue

Digital fatigue refers to a state of physical, visual, and cognitive exhaustion resulting from prolonged engagement with digital screens and interfaces. At the physiological level, it encompasses well-documented manifestations of Computer Vision Syndrome (CVS), including ocular surface disruption, accommodative stress, asthenopia, and associated cephalalgia (Blehm et al., 2005). At the cognitive level, digital fatigue reflects the depletion of attentional resources, as described by Kahneman's (1973) capacity model and more recent formulations of directed-attention fatigue (Kaplan, 1995).

A specific topography characterizes digital fatigue: it is most acute during or immediately after screen-based tasks, is partially recoverable through non-digital rest, and is not necessarily generalized to non-technological activities. This specificity has both diagnostic and intervention implications, as it suggests that digital fatigue may respond to targeted environmental modifications rather than requiring comprehensive treatment of a burnout syndrome.

Technostress

The construct of technostress was first introduced by Brod (1984) to describe a modern disease of adaptation caused by an inability to cope with new computer technologies in a healthy way. Subsequent empirical work by Weil and Rosen (1997) and, most influentially, by Tarafdar and colleagues (2007, 2008) transformed technostress from a popular concept into a rigorously operationalized research construct.

Tarafdar et al. (2007) identified five techno-stress creators: techno-overload, techno-invasion, techno-complexity, techno-insecurity, and techno-uncertainty. Salanova et al. (2013) subsequently demonstrated that technostress is a multidimensional phenomenon with both cognitive-affective and attitudinal components, exacerbated by organizational factors, including inadequate training, excessive monitoring, and role ambiguity.

Technological Burnout

Burnout, as conceptualized by Maslach and Jackson (1981) and subsequently refined by Maslach et al. (2001), comprises three interrelated dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Technological burnout, as conceptualized in this article, represents a specific manifestation of occupational burnout in which technology-mediated work constitutes the primary stressor. It is distinguishable from general burnout by the selectivity of its locus of symptoms: the individual may maintain adequate functioning in non-technological domains even while exhibiting pronounced burnout symptoms in technology-related work.

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model (Demerouti et al., 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) provides a particularly useful theoretical scaffolding for technological burnout. Within this framework, the chronic demands of digital work (cognitive overload, constant connectivity, rapid technological change) deplete personal and professional resources, culminating in burnout when replenishment is insufficient. Critically, technological burnout should not be conflated with technostress: technostress is a sustained stressor condition that, under sufficient chronicity and in the absence of adequate recovery resources, may progress toward burnout.

Associated Phenomena: Procrastination and Experiential Avoidance

Two psychological phenomena frequently co-occur with digital fatigue and technological burnout. Steel (2007) defined procrastination as a voluntary delay of an intended course of action despite expecting to be worse off as a result. In technology-related burnout, procrastination often takes a situationally specific form: selective delay of digital tasks, distinguishable from trait procrastination (Lay, 1986) and more closely aligned with avoidance-based coping mechanisms.

Hayes et al. (1996) introduced experiential avoidance as a functional construct describing the unwillingness to remain in contact with internal experiences associated with aversive events. In the context of technology-related burnout, the computer becomes a conditioned aversive stimulus: its mere presence triggers anticipatory distress, leading to avoidance behaviors maintained by negative reinforcement. This formulation positions technology-related avoidance within the theoretical framework of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT), with direct therapeutic implications.

Methodology

This article is a theoretical, narrative review rather than a systematic review or meta-analysis. Its purpose is integrative and conceptual: to differentiate a set of overlapping constructs, to appraise

the instruments used to assess them, and to translate that appraisal into practice recommendations. The narrative form was chosen because the relevant evidence is dispersed across several disciplines — occupational and organizational psychology, cognitive neuroscience, clinical assessment, and human–computer interaction — and because the analytical task is one of conceptual synthesis rather than effect-size estimation.

The literature surveyed spans foundational theoretical works and contemporary empirical and psychometric studies. Sources were identified through structured searches of Web of Science, Scopus, PsycINFO, and PubMed, supplemented by backward citation tracking of seminal works and instrument-validation papers. Search terms combined construct labels ("digital fatigue," "technostress," "technological burnout," "burnout," "procrastination," "experiential avoidance") with assessment terms ("scale," "inventory," "questionnaire," "psychometric properties," "validation," "normative data") and population terms ("knowledge workers," "academics," "occupational").

Assessment instruments were selected for detailed evaluation according to four criteria: documented psychometric validation in peer-reviewed sources; relevance to one or more constructs on the digital fatigue–burnout continuum; current use in occupational or clinical practice; and the availability of reliability and, where possible, normative information. The analytical framework organizing the review is the Job Demands-Resources model, complemented by the Effort-Recovery and Conservation of Resources models for the temporal dynamics of fatigue accumulation, and by the Acceptance and Commitment Therapy model of psychological flexibility for the process-level analysis of avoidance. Each instrument and construct was appraised against these frameworks and against the five assessment challenges developed in Section 5. As a conceptual review, no new empirical or human-participant data were collected.

Assessment Instruments: A Critical Overview

Burnout Measures

The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI; Maslach & Jackson, 1981) remains the gold standard for burnout assessment, with demonstrated reliability (α = .71–.90 across subscales) and extensive normative data across occupational groups. The Oldenburg Burnout Inventory (OLBI; Demerouti et al., 2003) offers a structural advantage through its bidirectional item format. The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI; Kristensen et al., 2005), by disaggregating burnout into personal, work-related, and client-related components, provides domain specificity particularly useful for identifying technology-specific exhaustion.

Technostress Measures

The Technostress Creators Scale (Ragu-Nathan et al., 2008) is currently the most comprehensively validated instrument for technology-specific stress (α = .78–.92 across subscales). Its subscale structure allows identification of the specific pathway through which technology generates distress. A notable limitation is that its validation is primarily in organizational Information Systems research contexts, with limited application in clinical psychological settings.

Cognitive Load, Fatigue, and Recovery Measures

The NASA Task Load Index (NASA-TLX; Hart & Staveland, 1988) assesses subjective workload across six dimensions and is particularly useful for documenting digital fatigue phenomenology in real time. The Cognitive Failures Questionnaire (CFQ; Broadbent et al., 1982) measures everyday cognitive errors elevated in mental fatigue states. The Mental Fatigue Scale (MFS; Åhsberg et al., 1997) assesses subjective fatigue across multiple dimensions and is sensitive to sustained cognitive work profiles.

The Recovery Experience Questionnaire (REQ; Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007) measures four recovery experiences (psychological detachment, relaxation, mastery, and control) that are systematically disrupted in technology-related burnout due to the pervasive intrusion of digital connectivity into recovery time. Its inclusion in an assessment battery provides critical information about the adequacy of the individual's recovery processes, which the Effort-Recovery Model (Meijman & Mulder, 1998) identifies as the central determinant of whether fatigue accumulates into pathological burnout.

Procrastination and Avoidance Measures

The General Procrastination Scale (GPS; Lay, 1986) and the Pure Procrastination Scale (PPS; Steel, 2010) offer complementary assessments of procrastination tendency. The Acceptance and Action Questionnaire–II (AAQ-II; Bond et al., 2011), a seven-item measure of psychological inflexibility and experiential avoidance ($\alpha = .84$), is particularly relevant in this context. Elevated AAQ-II scores, in conjunction with technology-specific avoidance patterns, support a case conceptualization anchored in ACT theory and have direct implications for treatment selection.

Assessment Challenges

Construct Overlap and Diagnostic Boundaries

Perhaps the most pervasive challenge in this domain is the considerable phenomenological overlap among digital fatigue, technostress, and technological burnout. All three constructs share core features (cognitive exhaustion, irritability, performance decrements, and avoidance of technology-related tasks) that existing instruments are not designed to disambiguate. A clinician administering the MBI-GS alongside the Technostress Creators Scale may encounter a profile of elevated exhaustion and techno-overload that is equally consistent with acute digital fatigue, early-stage technostress, or established technological burnout. No currently validated instrument provides sufficient diagnostic resolution to distinguish between these presentations reliably.

The absence of consensus diagnostic criteria in major nosological systems further complicates the theoretical boundaries between constructs. The ICD-11 includes burnout (QD85) as an occupational phenomenon, but without technology-specific specifiers. The DSM-5-TR offers no burnout category. This diagnostic vacuum forces clinicians to rely on theoretical judgment rather than operationalized criteria when formulating technology-related presentations, introducing

systematic variability into the assessment process that compromises both clinical communication and treatment outcome research.

Leiter and Maslach (2004) proposed the Areas of Worklife model to ground burnout diagnosis in specific organisational antecedents: workload, control, reward, community, fairness, and values. Applied to the technology context, this framework can help clinicians determine whether exhaustion is specifically rooted in technology-related demands or reflects a more general organizational dysfunction in which technology is merely the most visible stressor. This distinction is clinically significant: the former may respond to targeted digital-work modifications, whereas the latter requires broader organizational and psychotherapeutic interventions.

Ecological Validity and the Problem of Self-Report

All principal instruments in this domain rely on retrospective or momentary self-report. This methodological constraint is particularly consequential for assessing technology-related burnout among intellectually intensive populations. Several systematic biases affect the reliability of self-reports in this context.

Professional Identity and Self-Presentation Bias

Individuals engaged in knowledge-intensive professions (academics, researchers, clinicians, software engineers) frequently derive a substantial portion of their professional identity from their perceived intellectual competence and productivity. This identity investment creates a powerful motivation to underreport fatigue, avoidance, and performance decrements on self-report instruments, as such acknowledgements may be experienced as threatening to one's professional self-concept. Conversely, once burnout is culturally legitimised within a professional community, overclaiming burnout symptoms may serve social functions, including the justification of reduced productivity or the maintenance of peer solidarity (Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012). Both biases compromise the validity of self-report data and are difficult to detect without behavioural corroboration.

Retrospective Reconstruction Errors

Standard burnout inventories ask respondents to rate the frequency of symptoms over the preceding weeks or months, a retrospective window that is susceptible to memory-reconstruction biases, including mood-congruent recall, recency effects, and telescoping. For a construct whose intensity may vary considerably across days and tasks — as is characteristic of digital fatigue and technological burnout — a single retrospective rating necessarily fails to capture clinically relevant within-person variability. Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA) methodologies (Shiffman et al., 2008), which obtain repeated in-context self-reports distributed across time, represent a methodologically superior alternative and have demonstrated greater ecological validity than retrospective instruments in adjacent domains of occupational stress research.

The Absence of Behavioral and Physiological Indicators

Objective indicators of digital fatigue and technological burnout remain substantially underutilized in clinical psychological assessment. Physiological measures (salivary cortisol, heart rate variability, and skin conductance) provide indices of autonomic nervous system dysregulation that are theoretically associated with chronic occupational stress and burnout, and which are not susceptible to the self-presentation biases affecting self-report instruments. Research in adjacent domains has demonstrated that HRV indices sensitively reflect burnout-related autonomic dysregulation, while cortisol profiles differentiate acute stress responses from chronic depletion states characteristic of burnout (Sonnentag & Fritz, 2007).

Behavioral indicators are equally informative. Structured behavioral diaries documenting the frequency, duration, and emotional context of technology-task avoidance episodes provide data that self-report instruments cannot capture: the precise topography of avoidance, its temporal patterning, its relationship to specific task types, and the internal experiences that precede and follow avoidance. Such data are directly interpretable within ACT and behavioral activation frameworks and provide both diagnostic and treatment-monitoring information.

Absence of Technology-Specific Normative Data

The normative databases for the principal burnout instruments were constructed primarily from healthcare, education, and social service populations. The use of these norms to assess knowledge workers whose burnout is technology-mediated introduces systematic comparability problems across multiple dimensions. The nature of cognitive work, the topology of its demands, the meaning structures associated with it, and the coping resources characteristically available in knowledge-work environments differ substantially from those of human service professions, with direct implications for the patterning and expression of burnout.

Tarafdar et al. (2007) and Salanova et al. (2013) have argued for the development of occupation-specific norms for technostress measures, a recommendation that remains substantially unimplemented in clinical practice. The Technostress Creators Scale, for example, was normed in corporate Information Systems departments, thereby limiting its applicability to academic researchers, independent professionals, or clinical populations whose relationship with technology is structurally and motivationally different from that of corporate end-users.

The practical consequence for assessment is that score interpretation is necessarily inferential rather than actuarial. A score at the 75th percentile on the MBI Exhaustion subscale, relative to healthcare worker norms, carries different clinical significance for a software engineer or academic than for a nurse, in ways that current instruments do not adequately account for. The development of technology-worker-specific normative databases, stratified by occupational category and the intensity of technology use, is among the most pressing methodological needs in this research domain.

Temporal Dynamics: State versus Trait Ambiguity

Existing instruments generally assess burnout and fatigue as relatively stable states captured at a single time point. However, digital fatigue and technological burnout exhibit considerable within-person variability across contexts, times of day, and task demands. This temporal complexity creates two distinct assessment problems.

First, single-time-point assessments may fail to capture highly context-dependent and clinically significant presentations. An individual may score within normal limits on burnout measures administered in the morning yet exhibit pronounced exhaustion and avoidance after sustained afternoon computer work. This context-sensitivity means that negative screening results should not be interpreted as ruling out clinically significant technology-related burnout; they may reflect assessment at an insufficiently demanding moment in the individual's work cycle.

Second, the distinction between acute-state fatigue and chronically established burnout has direct treatment implications but is poorly captured by current instruments. Conservation of Resources (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) posits that burnout represents a state of resource depletion from which recovery becomes progressively more difficult as resource loss spirals accumulate. The clinical implication is that accurate longitudinal assessment (tracking the trajectory of fatigue and avoidance over weeks and months) is essential for distinguishing acute fatigue from established burnout, and for calibrating treatment intensity accordingly. Instruments that do not allow repeated administration and profile comparison over time are, therefore, inherently limited as burnout assessment tools in this domain.

Comorbidity and Differential Diagnosis

Technology-related burnout frequently co-occurs with, and may be difficult to differentiate from, several common psychopathological conditions, each of which requires distinct clinical management.

Major Depressive Disorder

The phenomenological overlap between technological burnout and Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) is substantial: both conditions involve fatigue, cognitive slowing, reduced motivation, anhedonia, and irritability. The differential diagnostic challenge is compounded by the fact that burnout may precipitate depressive episodes, and that depression may amplify burnout by further depleting the cognitive and emotional resources required for technology-mediated work. Hakanen and Schaufeli (2012) found in a longitudinal study that burnout predicted subsequent depressive symptoms more strongly than the reverse, suggesting a temporal sequence with clinical implications for prevention. Clinically, the key differentiating features are the domain-specificity of symptom onset (burnout is initially context-specific; depression typically generalizes), the presence of mood-independent anhedonia (more characteristic of depression), and the response to non-digital restorative activities (typically positive in burnout, less reliably so in depression).

Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder

Adult ADHD is a significant comorbidity consideration in the assessment of digital fatigue and technological burnout, particularly in academic and knowledge-work populations. Individuals with ADHD may present with apparently burnout-consistent profiles (chronic cognitive overload, frequent task-switching difficulties, procrastination, and irritability with sustained attention demands) that reflect neurodevelopmental rather than burnout-derived impairment. The clinical significance of this distinction lies in treatment implications: stimulant medication and ADHD-specific behavioral strategies constitute the first-line intervention for neurodevelopmental cognitive dysregulation, while burnout treatment requires rest, recovery promotion, and workload restructuring. Failure to assess ADHD in this population risks misattributing a neurodevelopmental presentation to a psychosocial one and delivering an ineffective treatment accordingly.

Anxiety Disorders and Techno-Anxiety

Techno-anxiety — a component of technostress, identified by Salanova et al. 2013) — involves anxiety specifically triggered by technology use or the anticipation of technological demands. When sufficiently severe, this presentation may meet criteria for a specific phobia (technology-related situational type) or, where avoidance is pervasive, for agoraphobia-like restriction of activities. The distinction from generalized anxiety is clinically relevant, as the former may respond to targeted exposure-based interventions while the latter typically requires broader anxiety management treatment. Assessment protocols should include structured clinical interview probing for the specificity, onset, and functional consequences of technology-related anxiety, supplemented where indicated by anxiety-specific self-report instruments.

Cultural and Organizational Contextual Factors

Assessment validity is further conditioned by cultural and organizational factors that most available instruments do not systematically address. Organizational cultures that explicitly or implicitly valorize constant connectivity (through expectations of after-hours email responsiveness, the normalization of weekend work, or performance metrics tied to digital output volume) create conditions in which technology-related burnout is systematically underreported due to social desirability bias. Individuals in such environments may lack a cultural reference point for healthy boundaries around technology use, making it difficult for them to identify their own exhaustion as pathological rather than normative accurately.

Hofstede's (2001) cultural dimensions framework suggests that individualism-collectivism and power distance orientations may influence both the experience and reporting of technology-related burnout across cultural contexts. High power distance environments, in which questioning supervisory expectations for technology use carries professional risk, may produce systematic underreporting even among individuals experiencing significant burnout. Clinicians working with populations from such organizational or cultural contexts should be alert to these pressures and supplement standardized instrument scores with culturally sensitive clinical interview strategies.

Implications for Psychological Practice

Integrative Assessment Protocol

Given the assessment limitations identified in Section 5, a four-phase integrative assessment protocol is proposed to evaluate digital fatigue and technological burnout in clinical and occupational settings.

Phase I: Screening and Triage

Initial screening should employ a brief combination of the CBI Work subscale, the Technostress Creators Scale techno-overload subscale (five items), and the AAQ-II. This minimal battery (approximately 17 items) provides sufficient sensitivity to identify individuals who warrant comprehensive assessment, while minimizing the assessment burden for those who screen negative. Crucially, screening should be conducted in the afternoon or after a technology-intensive work period, rather than in the morning, to avoid the assessment-time bias identified in Section 5.4.

Phase II: Comprehensive Self-Report Assessment

Individuals who screen positive should proceed to a comprehensive battery comprising: (a) the MBI-GS for dimensional burnout assessment; (b) the full Technostress Creators Scale for pathway identification; (c) the REQ for recovery adequacy assessment; (d) the GPS or PPS for procrastination tendency; (e) the CFQ for cognitive failure frequency; and (f) the AAQ-II for experiential avoidance quantification. This battery, totaling approximately 115 items, provides comprehensive coverage of the digital fatigue-burnout continuum while remaining administrable within a single assessment session.

Phase III: Structured Clinical Interview

Standardized self-report should be supplemented by a structured clinical interview addressing: technology use history (onset of complaints, precipitating events, prior episodes); task-specific avoidance topography (which specific digital tasks are avoided, under what conditions, with what emotional antecedents and consequences); impact assessment (occupational, social, and recreational functioning); recovery behavior quality (sleep, non-digital leisure, physical activity); comorbidity screening (depression, ADHD, anxiety); and organizational context (connectivity expectations, performance metrics, supervisory relationships). The interview should be conducted with explicit attention to the professional identity biases identified in Section 5.2.1, using normalization techniques to facilitate honest disclosure of avoidance and performance difficulties.

Phase IV: Behavioral and Functional Measurement

Where clinical complexity warrants it, Phase III should be supplemented with a two-week structured diary protocol in which the individual records daily the duration of technology-related work, episodes of task avoidance (with emotional context), subjective exhaustion ratings before and after computer sessions, and the quality of recovery activities. This longitudinal behavioral dataset provides temporal profiling data that single-time-point instruments cannot provide and is directly

interpretable within COR theory and the Effort-Recovery Model. Where available, objective physiological measures (HRV, cortisol awakening response) can provide additional validation of self-report data.

Case Conceptualization Frameworks

Two theoretical frameworks are particularly applicable to the clinical conceptualization of technological burnout, and they are best employed in combination rather than as alternatives.

The Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) provides a structural account of burnout development: when the chronic demands of technology-intensive work systematically exceed the individual's available resources — including cognitive capacity, social support, recovery time, and organizational autonomy — burnout emerges as the endpoint of a resource depletion spiral. The clinical utility of this framework lies in its identification of modifiable targets: demand reduction, resource replenishment, and the restoration of recovery adequacy are all legitimate, evidence-supported intervention targets that can be operationalized in a clinical formulation.

The ACT framework (Hayes et al., 1996; Bond et al., 2011) provides a complementary process-level account. In ACT terms, technological burnout is conceptualized as a self-perpetuating cycle in which technology-associated aversive internal experiences — fatigue, frustration, anxiety — trigger experiential avoidance responses (procrastination, postponement, physical distancing from the workstation), which provide short-term negative reinforcement while generating long-term functional impairment and values-inconsistent behavior. The treatment goal is not the elimination of digital work discomfort but the development of psychological flexibility: the capacity to engage with technology-related tasks while holding the discomfort associated with openness, curiosity, and acceptance rather than avoidance.

In complex cases, particularly those with significant comorbidity (Section 5.5), an integrated formulation drawing on both frameworks is warranted. The JD-R model informs the structural and organisational dimensions of the presentation; ACT addresses the psychological processes through which the individual relates to their experience of those demands. Together, they provide a clinically comprehensive account that bridges environmental determinants and psychological mediators.

Phased Intervention Recommendations

Intervention should be calibrated to the severity and chronicity of the presentation, as identified through the Phase I–IV assessment protocol.

Stage 1: Digital Fatigue

Where digital fatigue is the primary presentation — recent onset, clear temporal association with screen exposure, no significant cynicism or depersonalization, recovery-responsive — environmental and behavioural interventions are typically sufficient as a first-line approach. Evidence-based components include: structured recovery intervals following the Pomodoro or 52/17 protocols; blue-light filtration and ergonomic screen adjustments to reduce ocular load;

integration of restorative exposure to natural environments during recovery periods (Kaplan, 1995); and psychoeducation on the neurophysiological basis of directed-attention fatigue and its natural recovery trajectory.

Stage 2: Technostress and Early Burnout

Where technostress is established — evidenced by one or more elevated technostress creator subscales alongside moderate burnout indicators — structured psychological intervention is indicated. Cognitive-behavioral approaches targeting technology-specific dysfunctional beliefs ("I must be reachable at all times"; "If I am not productive at the computer, I am failing professionally") combined with behavioural activation targeting non-digital activities associated with positive reinforcement are well-supported by the general occupational stress intervention literature (Hakanen & Schaufeli, 2012). Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR; Shapiro et al., 2005) has demonstrated efficacy in occupational burnout populations and may be particularly indicated where technostress is accompanied by hyperreactivity and rumination about technology-related demands.

Stage 3: Established Technological Burnout

Where full technological burnout is established — characterized by significant exhaustion across the MBI dimensions, conditioned technology-specific avoidance, and impaired occupational functioning — intensive and comprehensive intervention is required. Treatment should address the psychological, behavioral, and organizational dimensions of the presentation simultaneously. ACT-based work targeting the experiential avoidance cycle constitutes the psychological core of intervention; behavioral work addressing the structural conditions of recovery inadequacy (sleep hygiene, boundary-setting, digital disconnection protocols) addresses the physiological dimension; and organizational consultation or assertiveness training targeting unrealistic technology use expectations addresses the environmental determinants identified by the JD-R model.

Psychoeducation and Prevention

Psychoeducation constitutes a critical but frequently underemphasized component of both intervention and prevention in this domain. Many individuals presenting with digital fatigue and technological burnout lack a conceptual framework for understanding their experience: they interpret their avoidance of computer tasks as laziness, their irritability as a character defect, and their cognitive slowing as evidence of intellectual decline. These misattributions compound the original distress, generate secondary shame and self-criticism, and may delay help-seeking by years.

An effective psychoeducational intervention should communicate three core messages. First, digital fatigue and technological burnout are lawful neuropsychological phenomena with well-characterized physiological correlates, not moral failures or signs of intellectual inadequacy. Second, the symptoms being experienced (particularly the selective avoidance of technology-related tasks) are a predictable response of the nervous system to chronic overstimulation, whose persistence is maintained by negative reinforcement rather than by fixed personality traits. Third, recovery is possible, typically rapid in the early stages, but requires the deliberate and systematic restoration of recovery behaviors that chronic burnout has displaced.

In preventive contexts, psychoeducation is most effectively delivered in organizational settings, targeting both individual employees, their supervisors and organizational leaders. Fledderus et al. (2010) have argued for integrating ACT-based mental health promotion within organizational frameworks to prevent the escalation from subclinical distress to clinical burnout. A particularly important preventive target is the normalization of digital disconnection: organizational cultures that explicitly support and reward boundary-setting around technology use demonstrate consistently lower rates of technostress and burnout than those that treat constant connectivity as a performance standard.

Organizational-Level Interventions

Individual psychological intervention, however skilled, operates within organizational contexts that may sustain or even intensify the conditions generating technological burnout. Clinical psychologists working with burnout presentations should therefore be prepared to extend their conceptualization and, where appropriate, their interventions to the organizational level.

The JD-R model (Demerouti et al., 2001) provides a directly actionable framework for organizational intervention: demand reduction through workload restructuring, task batching, and the elimination of low-value technological activities; resource augmentation through enhanced autonomy, social support from supervisors, and explicit skill development for technology navigation; and the active protection of recovery time through organizational policies restricting after-hours connectivity expectations. Research by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) has demonstrated that organizational interventions targeting resources are particularly effective when they operate at the level of job design rather than merely at the level of individual competence, reinforcing the importance of systemic rather than purely focused approaches.

Psychologists in organizational consulting roles may also advocate for implementing structured "digital detox" periods, quiet-hours policies, and meeting-free blocks of focused work time. Csikszentmihalyi's (1990) research on flow states suggests that sustained, uninterrupted engagement with meaningful cognitive tasks is not only psychologically restorative but may also constitute a primary resource in the resource-conservation terms of COR theory (Hobfoll, 1989), providing a positive counterweight to the resource-depleting demands of fragmented, notification-interrupted digital work.

Ethical Considerations in Assessment and Monitoring

The clinical and organizational assessment of technology-related burnout raises several ethical considerations that deserve explicit recognition.

First, the deployment of behavioral monitoring technologies — software logging keystroke frequency, application usage time, or screen activity patterns — as supplementary assessment tools raises significant privacy and consent concerns. While such data can, in principle, provide objective behavioral correlates of digital fatigue and avoidance, their collection in employment contexts creates power asymmetries that may compromise voluntary participation and introduce performance anxiety that distorts the very behaviors being assessed. Clinicians recommending

behavioral monitoring should ensure that data ownership, access limitations, and the boundaries of clinical use are explicitly defined and agreed upon prior to data collection.

Second, assessment findings obtained in clinical contexts must be carefully protected from organizational use in ways that could disadvantage the assessed individual. The diagnosis or clinical formulation of technological burnout should not be communicated to employers without explicit informed consent, and clinicians should be alert to organizational contexts in which the pressure to share clinical information is implicit rather than formally coercive.

Third, the increasing availability of AI-assisted mood and fatigue monitoring applications raises novel questions about the appropriate boundaries of clinical assessment in digital work contexts. While such tools may provide clinically useful ecological data, their algorithmic opacity, data retention practices, and potential for misuse in employment decision-making contexts represent ethical risks that the psychological profession has not yet systematically addressed. Psychologists should approach the integration of such tools into assessment protocols with the same ethical scrutiny applied to any assessment instrument, ensuring that data protection, informed consent, and clinical validity standards are met.

Conclusions

The progression from digital fatigue through technostress to technological burnout constitutes a clinically significant and theoretically coherent continuum that the psychological profession has been slow to recognise fully and to address systematically. The available assessment instruments, while individually valuable, do not yet constitute a comprehensive, technology-specific assessment battery, and their application in clinical practice is complicated by construct overlap, normative limitations, the constraints of static self-report methodology, temporal state-trait ambiguity, and the comorbidity challenges identified in the present review.

The expanded clinical implications outlined in Section 6 aim to translate the assessment literature into actionable protocols for psychologists working with intellectually intensive occupational populations. The four-phase integrative assessment protocol, grounded in both the JD-R and ACT theoretical frameworks, provides a clinically comprehensive approach sensitive to the specific diagnostic challenges of this domain. The phased intervention model allows treatment intensity to be calibrated to the severity of presentation. At the same time, attention to psychoeducation, organizational-level factors, and ethical considerations reflects the systemic complexity inherent in technology-related burnout.

As digital work becomes ever more pervasive and the boundaries between professional and personal technology use continue to dissolve, technological burnout is best understood not as an isolated clinical entity but as the individual-level expression of a wider social transformation, such as work. The clinical and research communities must accelerate their collective response to a challenge that is not merely emerging but, for many professionals, already deeply established.

Suggestions for Future Research

Several research priorities emerge with urgency. First, the development and validation of technology-specific burnout instruments, with normative data stratified by occupational category and intensity of technology use, would address the most fundamental measurement gap in the field. Second, large-scale validation of EMA-based assessment protocols in clinical populations is needed to determine whether repeated in-context sampling improves diagnostic accuracy and treatment monitoring compared with retrospective self-report. Third, longitudinal studies that track the progression of digital fatigue–technostress–burnout and its modifiable determinants are required to clarify causal pathways and identify optimal points for early intervention. Fourth, cross-cultural research is needed to examine how individualism–collectivism, power distance, and organizational connectivity norms shape the experience, expression, and reporting of technological burnout across national and sectoral contexts. Fifth, rigorously controlled intervention-efficacy studies — comparing ACT-based, cognitive-behavioral, and organizational-level approaches — are needed to establish which treatments work, for whom, and at which stage of the continuum. Collectively, these directions would move the field from conceptual differentiation toward an evidence-based, technology-specific science of assessment and intervention.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks the colleagues at the Department of Psychology, Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu, for their constructive comments on earlier drafts, and the anonymous reviewer for their recommendations, which improved the structure and completeness of this manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Funding

The Author received no funding for this research.

References

Åhsberg, E., Gamberale, F., & Kjellberg, A. (1997). Perceived quality of fatigue during different types of activity. *Work & Stress*, *11*(4), 278–294. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678379708256840

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *22*(3), 309–328. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710733115

Blehm, C., Vishnu, S., Khattak, A., Mitra, S., & Yee, R. W. (2005). Computer vision syndrome: A review. *Survey of Ophthalmology*, *50*(3), 253–262. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.survophthal.2005.02.008

Bond, F. W., Hayes, S. C., Baer, R. A., Carpenter, K. M., Guenole, N., Orcutt, H. K., Waltz, T., & Zettle, R. D. (2011). Preliminary psychometric properties of the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire–II: A revised measure of psychological inflexibility and experiential avoidance. *Behavior Therapy*, *42*(4), 676–688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2011.03.007

Broadbent, D. E., Cooper, P. F., FitzGerald, P., & Parkes, K. R. (1982). The Cognitive Failures Questionnaire (CFQ) and its correlates. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *21*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8260.1982.tb01421.x

Brod, C. (1984). *Technostress: The human cost of the computer revolution*. Addison-Wesley.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. Harper & Row.

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(3), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499

Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Vardakou, I., & Kantas, A. (2003). The convergent validity of two burnout instruments. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, *19*(1), 12–23. https://doi.org/10.1027//1015-5759.19.1.12

Fledderus, M., Bohlmeijer, E. T., Smit, F., & Westerhof, G. J. (2010). Mental health promotion as a new goal in public mental health care: A randomized controlled trial of an intervention enhancing psychological flexibility. *American Journal of Public Health*, *100*(12), 2372–2378. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2010.196196

Hakanen, J. J., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2012). Do burnout and work engagement predict depressive symptoms and life satisfaction? A three-wave seven-year prospective study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *141*(2–3), 415–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jad.2012.02.043

Hart, S. G., & Staveland, L. E. (1988). Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of empirical and theoretical research. In P. A. Hancock & N. Meshkati (Eds.), *Human mental workload* (pp. 139–183). North-Holland. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9

Hayes, S. C., Wilson, K. G., Gifford, E. V., Follette, V. M., & Strosahl, K. (1996). Experiential avoidance and behavioral disorders: A functional dimensional approach to diagnosis and treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *64*(6), 1152–1168. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.64.6.1152

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American Psychologist*, *44*(3), 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). SAGE.

Kahneman, D. (1973). *Attention and effort*. Prentice-Hall.

Kaplan, S. (1995). The restorative benefits of nature: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *15*(3), 169–182. https://doi.org/10.1016/0272-4944(95)90001-2

Kristensen, T. S., Borritz, M., Villadsen, E., & Christensen, K. B. (2005). The Copenhagen Burnout Inventory: A new tool for the assessment of burnout. *Work & Stress*, *19*(3), 192–207. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678370500297720

Lay, C. H. (1986). At last, my research article on procrastination. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *20*(4), 474–495. https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-6566(86)90127-3

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2004). Areas of worklife: A structured approach to organizational predictors of job burnout. *Research in Occupational Stress and Well Being*, *3*, 91–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1479-3555(03)03003-8

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, *2*(2), 99–113. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.4030020205

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*(1), 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397

Meijman, T. F., & Mulder, G. (1998). Psychological aspects of workload. In P. J. D. Drenth & H. Thierry (Eds.), *Handbook of work and organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 5–33). Psychology Press.

Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and validation. *Information Systems Research*, *19*(4), 417–433. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1070.0165

Salanova, M., Llorens, S., & Cifre, E. (2013). The dark side of technologies: Technostress among users of information and communication technologies. *International Journal of Psychology*, *48*(3), 422–436. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.680460

Schaufeli, W. B., Leiter, M. P., Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1996). Maslach Burnout Inventory–General Survey. In C. Maslach, S. E. Jackson, & M. P. Leiter (Eds.), *MBI manual* (3rd ed., pp. 19–26). Consulting Psychologists Press.

Seguí, M. M., Cabrero-García, J., Crespo, A., Verdú, J., & Ronda, E. (2015). A reliable and valid questionnaire was developed to measure computer vision syndrome at the workplace. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *68*(6), 662–673. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.01.015

Shapiro, S. L., Astin, J. A., Bishop, S. R., & Cordova, M. (2005). Mindfulness-based stress reduction for health care professionals. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *12*(2), 164–176. https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.12.2.164

Shiffman, S., Stone, A. A., & Hufford, M. R. (2008). Ecological momentary assessment. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *4*, 1–32. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.3.022806.091415

Sonnentag, S., & Fritz, C. (2007). The Recovery Experience Questionnaire: Development and validation of a measure for assessing recuperation and unwinding from work. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *12*(3), 204–221. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8998.12.3.204

Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*(1), 65–94. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.65

Steel, P. (2010). Arousal, avoidant and decisional procrastinators: Do they exist? *Personality and Individual Differences*, *48*(8), 926–934. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.02.025

Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *24*(1), 301–328. https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222240109

Weil, M. M., & Rosen, L. D. (1997). *TechnoStress: Coping with technology @work @home @play*. Wiley.

World Health Organization. (2019, May 28). *Burn-out an "occupational phenomenon": International Classification of Diseases*. https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases

Zijlstra, F. R. H., & Sonnentag, S. (2006). After work is done: Psychological perspectives on recovery from work. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *15*(2), 129–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/13594320500513855