Current Science Research Bulletin
Volume 02 (02), February 2025, pp. 24-35
CrossRef DOI: 10.55677/csrb/03-V02I02Y2025
Available on: https://csrbjournal.org/index.php/csrb
e-ISSN: 3050-7103
p-ISSN: 3050-709X

Academic Burnout among College Students during Hybrid Learning

Wynona Faye Aquino[1], Christine Faye Ramento[2], Ma. Victoria Kristell Yalong[3], Michelle Karla Capili[4], Darin Jan Tindowen[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]School of Education, Criminology, Arts and Psychology, University of Saint Louis, Tuguegarao City, Philippines

ABSTRACT: The emergence of the COVID-19 dilemma caused universities to implement a range of solutions to offset the pandemic's educational impact, resulting in the development of hybrid learning, which combines in-person and online learning. Whereas burnout is commonly thought to only occur in workplaces but is also experienced by students during learning, particularly when students must simultaneously adapt to both face-to-face and online environments. Academic burnout is defined as a state of physical, mental, and emotional weariness caused by prolonged or recurring stress at school. With this study, the researchers aim to shed light on the factors of Academic Burnout during Hybrid learning of the University of Saint Louis- Tuguegarao College students. This study utilizes a quantitative type of research employing a descriptive-correlational research design in determining the Factors of Academic Burnout during Hybrid Learning. There were 350 respondents in the study selected through a stratified random sampling technique. An adapted questionnaire was used to gather relevant data, and utilized statistical tools such as mean and chi-square were used to analyze the data. Results indicate that college students frequently experience academic burnout, scoring the highest on the dimension of emotional exhaustion. The findings of this study also show that female students when compared to their male counterparts, have higher level of emotional exhaustion. So, students from the School of Accountancy, Business and Hospitality when compared to other departments. Additionally, older students, specifically the age group of 24-26 years old, fourth-year students, and students with units below 10 scored the highest in cynicism. Moreover, students from the School of Health and Allied Sciences department have the highest level of academic efficacy compared to other departments.

KEYWORDS: Academic Burnout, Hybrid Learning, Emotional Exhaustion, Cynicism, Academic Efficacy

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 virus has unexpectedly forced higher education institutions all over the world to change their preferred methods of instruction from traditional face-to-face teaching to virtual learning and, most recently, hybrid learning. As a result of the pandemic, this abrupt change has significantly disrupted academic activity at universities and presented numerous challenges to students. This situation has made learning considerably more stressful than it already is for many students, increasing their risk of experiencing academic burnout (Zitter & Hoeve, 2012).

The concept of burnout has been expanded from the initial assumption that it exclusively occurs in the workplace to the broadened concept that it is also being experienced by students (Ljubin-Golub & Rijavec, 2019). Academic burnout is a condition of physical, mental, and emotional exhaustion brought on by persistent or recurrent stress at school (Kochuchakkalackal, 2021). Academic burnout among students occurs due to overwhelming stressors due to heavy workloads, social demands, and hostile learning settings, which adversely affect college students' physical and emotional health (Felaza et al., 2020). It is also associated with feelings of academic exhaustion, developing cynical attitudes toward studying, and feeling incompetent or inefficient as a student (Ljubin-Golub & Rijavec, 2019).

The onset of the COVID-19 dilemma compelled institutions to take a variety of strategies to mitigate the pandemic's educational impact. COVID-19 exemplified the importance of distance education, but in-person education must still be preserved in order to conduct science and technical courses in the future (Idrizi & Vladimir, S.,2022). As a result, institutions are accelerating toward the direction of hybrid learning to enhance the quality of teaching in higher education while reducing the impact of adverse events like COVID-19 (Sanpanich, 2021). Hybrid learning blends in-person and online learning (Idrizi et al., 2022; Sanpanich, 2021). Because of its adaptability and accessibility, the adoption of hybrid learning increases the educational options available to

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

students (Shimkovich et al., 2022). In the face-to-face classroom of the hybrid learning format, a teacher moderates and imparts knowledge while activities are held in class to promote participation, skill development, and cooperation as well as collaboration. For online learning, students can access educational resources and engage in self-directed learning using a variety of online platforms (Sanpanich, 2021). Since academic responsibilities are no longer just established within the classroom but also in the digital spaces used by universities in accordance with this learning technique, this new model of learning, to which students had to adapt, prompted concerns due to the doubled workloads. (Makhachashvili & Semenist, 2021). Shimkovich et al. (2022) asserted that students find hybrid learning styles challenging to comprehend as their success decreases, which might result from a challenge adjusting to new learning circumstances. Due to the generally high academic demands of hybrid learning, along with a range of other life pressures, students are confronted with exposure to high levels of stress, and all of these factors together indicate the risk of student academic burnout (Liu & Cao, 2022; Zitter & Hoeve, 2012).

Academic burnout is a condition that can arise in various circumstances and is predicted by various psychological and environmental factors (Kochuchakkalackal, 2021). A person who is exposed to a new environment, people, social support, gender, living condition, and student performance must be evaluated since these factors are essential for university students and may harm their drive to study, leading to academic burnout (Bonafé, Maroco & Campos, 2014; Kochuchakkalackal, 2021; Ye, Huang & Liu, 2021). Ahmad et al. (2015) proven that academic burnout is significantly related to age, as seniors were more fatigued than freshmen. Accordingly, female students are more prone to experience burnout than male students due to a larger perceived impact of stressors, which shows the detailed analysis of gender differences. High levels of burnout are also a result of the increasing degree of difficulty imposed on the students as they progress to their chosen courses (Boni et al., 2018). Students who live alone also have higher burnout levels (Ljubin-Golub et al., 2017). And regardless of the physical resource realities, adequate social support is likely to develop a positive perception of life evaluation, which will enable them to pull themselves out of the academic burnout condition (Ye, Huang & Liu, 2021).

The numerous difficulties posed by hybrid learning, coupled with the ongoing uncertainties, have made students vulnerable to developing academic burnout. In order to create prevention programs and better educational plan management, it is essential to identify the underlying factors of academic burnout, considering the repercussions it has on students' emotional and physical health and academic performance (Rahmatpour et al., 2019). Several studies have been conducted to investigate academic burnout and its factors in traditional face-to-face settings and online distance learning. However, due to the emergence of new educational models due to the COVID-19 outbreak, there is still a dearth of research demonstrating the effectiveness of hybrid learning and how teachers can apply this strategy to give students meaningful learning.

Thus, this study should also be made to comprehend the advantages of hybrid learning and how instructors can use it to support learning in higher education settings. Considering the learning structure of the University of Saint Louis in this now normal, conducting this study will serve as an instrument in adding a body of information concerning academic burnout among college students who are participating in hybrid learning by identifying its factors. Specifically, the main objective of the study is to determine the Factors of Academic Burnout among college students along emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and academic efficacy.

METHOD

The study utilized a quantitative type of Descriptive-Correlational Research Design to determine the Factors of Academic Burnout during Hybrid Learning. Descriptive design was used to determine the respondents' profiles and students' academic burnout levels. The study was conducted at the University of Saint Louis Tuguegarao. Specifically in the University's college department is composed of four academic departments, which are the School of Education, Arts, and Sciences, the School of Health, and Allied Sciences; the School of Engineering, Architecture, and Information Technology Education, and the School of Accountancy, Business, and Hospitality.

Respondents of this study came from the College department studying at the University of Saint Louis-Tuguegarao in the Academic Year 2022-2023. Respondents were selected as the sample based on their profiles using a stratified random sampling technique to make sure that the results coming from the respondents were representative of the whole population of college students from different departments in the University of Saint Louis-Tuguegarao.

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

Table 1. Distribution of Respondents of the Study

Department	Sample Size	Percentage
School of Accountancy, Business, and Hospitality	110	31.40
School of Engineering, Architecture, and Information Technology Education	150	40.00
School of Education, Arts, and Sciences	38	10.90
School of Health, and Allied Sciences	62	17.70
TOTAL	350	100.00

This study utilized a survey questionnaire to examine the factors of academic burnout among college students. The questionnaire was divided into two (2) parts. First part of the questionnaire was about the profile of the respondents, which included age, sex, year level, department, living condition, number of units enrolled, source of financial support, and source of social support. The first part of the instrument is a nominal value and is included as a necessary factor that helped determine the relationship between the respondents' profile and academic burnout. The second part was on college students' academic burnout level, which was adapted from the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Student Survey (Schaufeli, et al., 2002). The Maslach Burnout Inventory- Student Survey is a 15-item questionnaire divided into three domains, namely, Emotional Exhaustion, Cynicism, and Academic Efficacy, and was used to identify the level of Academic Burnout of Students. The researchers contextualized the academic burnout questions related to hybrid learning in the MBI-SS questionnaire. The Maslach Burnout Inventory-Student Survey is a Likert scale type of questionnaire that significantly determines the relationship between the respondents' profiles and academic burnout.

Frequency and percentage, weighted mean, Independent Sample T-test, and One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used to analyze the data needed in the study with the following range, qualitative descriptions, and interpretation:

Range	Qualitative Description	Interpretation
5.50 - 6.00	Extremely High	This range indicates an extremely high level of burnout. Students are likely to experience severe exhaustion, cynicism, and a decreased sense of accomplishment related to their academic activities.
4.50 - 5.49	Very High	Falling within this range signifies a very high level of academic burnout. Students may be experiencing significant exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced effectiveness in their academic pursuits.
3.50 - 4.49	High	This range indicates a high level of academic burnout. Students might be experiencing notable exhaustion, cynicism, and a decline in their academic performance and motivation.
2.50 - 3.49	Average	Falling within this range suggests an average level of academic burnout. Students may be experiencing some degree of exhaustion and cynicism but may still have a moderate level of motivation and engagement in their academic activities.
1.50 - 2.49	Low	This range indicates a low level of academic burnout. Students might be experiencing mild exhaustion or cynicism, but overall, their academic engagement and motivation remain relatively intact.
0.50 - 1.49	Very Low	Falling within this range suggests a very low level of academic burnout. Students may experience minimal exhaustion or cynicism and have a generally positive outlook on their academic pursuits.
0.00 - 0.49	Extremely Low	This range represents an extremely low level of academic burnout. Students will likely not experience significant exhaustion, cynicism, or negative impacts on their academic well-being.

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

RESULTS

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

PROFILE	FREQUENCY	PERCENTAGE
Age		
17-19 years old	72	20.60
20-21 years old	197	56.30
22-23 years old	77	22.00
24-26 years old	4	1.10
Sex		
Male	122	34.90
Female	228	65.10
Year Level		
First Year	79	22.60
Second Year	79	22.60
Third Year	129	36.90
Fourth Year	63	18.00
Department		
SEAS	38	10.90
SABH	110	31.40
SEAITE	140	40.00
SHAS	62	17.70
Living Condition		
Living with parents	185	52.90
Living alone	37	10.60
Tenant	116	33.10
Others	12	3.40
Number of Units		
Below 10 units	24	6.90
Between 10-15 units	17	4.90
Between 15-20 units	13	3.70
Between 20-25 units	120	34.30
Above 25 units	176	50.30
Source of Financial Support		
Parents	133	38.00
Relatives	56	16.00
Scholarship	1	.30
Self-support	2	.60
More than one source of Financial Support	158	45.10
Source of Social Support		
Family	280	80.00
Friends	11	3.10
Classmates	12	3.40
Teachers	9	2.60
More than one source of Social Support	38	10.90
TOTAL:	350	

A total of 350 college students participated in the survey. As shown in the table, the majority of the respondents were female, whereas the highest reported number were those between 20-21 years old. The table also indicates that most respondents are third-year students, while under the department profile, the School of Engineering, Architecture, and Information Technology Education has the highest reported percentage of respondents overall. Most respondents indicated that they are enrolled in more than 25 units and live with their parents. The highest reported percentage of respondents in terms of financial support stated that

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

they have more than one source of financial support among the choices that were indicated in the questionnaire. Lastly, the majority of the respondents cited their family as their primary source of social support.

Table 2. Levels of Academic Burnout

Levels of Academic Burnout	Mean	Quantitative Description
Exhaustion	4.26	High
Cynicism	3.28	Average
Academic Efficacy	3.79	High
Overall Academic Burnout	3.96	High

Table 2 shows the mean of the three subscales of academic burnout, namely Emotional Exhaustion, Cynicism, and Academic Efficacy. The results indicate that the respondents rated themselves as more burnout on the scale of Emotional Exhaustion than Academic Efficacy and Cynicism. This means that the overall academic burnout of the respondents is high. The students experience high levels of Emotional Exhaustion during hybrid learning and have the highest levels compared to cynicism and academic efficacy. This implies that students frequently experience feeling emotionally drained, and worn out about their studies; feel used up at the end of the day in their classes, and attending classes really stresses them. Moreover, they feel that waking up in the morning is tiring because they have to face another day in class during hybrid learning.

The cynicism experienced by students during hybrid learning is at an average level and is shown to exhibit lower levels compared to emotional exhaustion and academic efficacy. This implies that students are occasionally less interested and less excited about their studies during hybrid learning. Additionally, students high in cynicism cannot see the potential usefulness of their studies and feel that their work does not make a difference anymore to anyone. The students experience high levels of academic efficacy during hybrid learning and have a higher level compared to cynicism but lower in academic exhaustion. This implies that students frequently experience sufficient energy and the inner drive and motivation to accomplish their school works effectively. They can also effectively control how their work should be done and solve problems that may arise in their studies during hybrid learning. In addition to that, the students are described to be good students and exhibit confidence in their effectiveness at getting things done throughout implementing hybrid learning.

High levels of overall Academic Burnout are experienced by students during hybrid learning and are characterized by numerous traits such as exhaustion caused by the very idea of studying, excessive academic workload and expectations, an increasing cynicism, and reduction of academic efficacy when an individual assesses himself negatively, feels he is unable to move the situation forward and begins to doubt his genuine abilities to accomplish things.

Table 3. Significant Difference in the Academic Burnout of the Respondents when Grouped According to Profile

PROFILE	EXHAUSTION	CYNICISM	ACADEMIC EFFICACY	OVERALL ACADEMIC BURNOUT
Age	.258	.022*	.809	.138
Sex	.000*	.520	.877	.289
Year Level	.113	.006*	.865	.054
Department	.000*	.169	.007*	.074
Living Condition	.574	.716	.125	.395
Number of Units	.110	.021*	.826	.112
Source of Financial Support	.284	.227	.325	.153
Source of Social Support	.859	.452	.721	.855

**significant at .05 level*

Table 3 presents the significant difference in the Academic Burnout of the respondents when grouped according to their profile variables. It can be shown from the table that there is a significant difference in the Academic Burnout of the respondents along with Cynicism when grouped according to age, year level, and number of units. Meanwhile, a significant difference also exists in the respondents' Academic Burnout and Emotional Exhaustion when grouped according to sex and department. Finally, there is a significant difference in the Academic Burnout of the respondents along with Academic Efficacy when grouped according to Department. This means that Academic Burnout varies in terms of these variables.

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

Table 3a. Post-Hoc Test Analysis on the Significant Difference in the Academic Burnout of the Respondents along Cynicism when Grouped According to Age

Age Group	Mean	17-19	20-21	22-23	24-26
17-19 years old	3.60	1			
20-21 years old	3.86	.106	1		
22-23 years old	4.17	.003*	.048*	1	
24-26 years old	4.38	.193	.377	.725	1

Table 3a shows the post hoc test analysis on Academic Burnout of the Respondents along Cynicism when Grouped According to Age. It can be shown from the table that a significant difference exists between the age groups of 17-19, 20-21 years old, and 22-23 years old. In terms of cynicism, respondents from the age group of 22-23 years old have a higher level of burnout than that of the age group 17-19. Similarly, respondents from the age group of 22-23 years old are more cynical than those 20-21 years old.

Table 3b. Significant Difference on the Academic Stress of the Respondents along Exhaustion when Grouped According to Sex.

Sex	Mean	t-value	p-value
Male	3.99	-3.596	.000
Female	4.40		

Table 3b shows the post hoc test analysis on the respondents' Academic Burnout and Emotional Exhaustion when grouped according to sex. It can be shown from the table that a significant difference exists between male and female respondents, with female respondents being more emotionally exhausted compared to male respondents. In terms of Emotional Exhaustion, female students have a higher level of burnout in comparison to their male counterparts.

Table 3c. Post-Hoc Test Analysis on the Significant Difference in the Academic Burnout of the Respondents along Cynicism when Grouped According to Year Level

Year Group	Mean	1st Year	2nd Year	3rd Year	4th Year
1st Year	3.53	1			
2nd Year	3.88	.055	1		
3rd Year	3.92	.017*	.802	1	
4th Year	4.21	.001*	.095	.109	1

Table 3c shows the post hoc test analysis on Academic Burnout of the Respondents along Cynicism when Grouped According to the respondents' year level. It can be shown from the table that a significant difference exists between first-year, third-year, and fourth-year respondents. Wherein this table indicates that first-year respondents are less cynical than third-year respondents. Consequently, first-year respondents also exhibit less cynical attitudes toward their academics than fourth-year respondents.

Table 3d. Post-Hoc Test Analysis on the Significant Difference in the Academic Burnout of the Respondents along Exhaustion when Grouped According to Department

Department	Mean	SEAS	SABH	SEAITE	SHAS
SEAS	4.45	1			
SABH	4.53	.654	1		
SEAITE	4.00	.015*	.000*	1	
SHAS	4.25	.340	.077	.104	1

Table 3d shows the post hoc test analysis on the respondents' Academic Burnout and Emotional Exhaustion when grouped according to the department. It can be shown from the table that a significant difference exists between the departments of the School of Education, Arts and Sciences, School of Engineering, Architecture, Information Technology Education, and School of Accountancy, Business, and Hospitality, whereas respondents in the School of Engineering, Architecture, and Information Technology Education exhibit lower levels of Emotional Exhaustion compared to respondents from the School of Education, Arts,

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

and Sciences. The results also show that respondents from the School of Engineering, Architecture, Information Technology Education are less emotionally exhausted than respondents from the School of Accountancy, Business, and Hospitality.

Table 3e. Post-Hoc Test Analysis on the Significant Difference in the Academic Burnout of the Respondents along Academic Efficacy when Grouped According to Department

Department	Mean	SEAS	SABH	SEAITE	SHAS
SEAS	3.55	1			
SABH	3.75	.236	1		
SEAITE	3.74	.239	.951	1	
SHAS	4.12	.002*	.008*	.005	1

Table 3e shows the post hoc test analysis on the respondents' Academic Burnout and Academic Efficacy when grouped according to the department. Results show the reversed results of the significant difference between respondents from the School of Education, Arts, and Sciences and the School of Accountancy, Business, and Hospitality departments, respondents from the School of Health and Allied Sciences, wherein the higher mean equates to lower academic efficacy. This implies that respondents from the School of Health and Allied Sciences have less Academic Efficacy than those from the School of Education, Arts, and Sciences. Comparably, those respondents from the School of Business, Accountancy, and Hospitality scored higher in Academic Efficacy than those who are from the School of Health and Allied Sciences.

Table 3f. Post-Hoc Test Analysis on the Significant Difference in the Academic Burnout of the Respondents along Cynicism when Grouped According to Number of Units

No. of Units	Mean	Below 10 units	10-15 units	15-20 units	20-25 units	Above 25 units
Below 10 units	4.51	1				
Between 10-15 units	4.13	.304	1			
Between 15-20 units	3.32	.003*	.060	1		
Between 20-25 units	3.78	.005*	.246	.178	1	
Above 25 units	3.87	.012	.375	.104	.525	1

Table 3f reveals the post hoc test analysis on Academic Burnout of the Respondents along with Cynicism when Grouped According to the respondents' total number of units. It shows a significant difference exists between respondents who have below 10 units, 15-20 units, and 20-25 units. Respondents with below 10 units have higher cynicism levels than respondents with between 15-2- units, and between 20-25 units. In terms of cynicism, students with below 10 units have the highest level of burnout.

DISCUSSION

The common assumption that burnout typically occurs in the workplace has broadened to the concept that it is also experienced by students during learning, especially in environments where students need to accommodate learning through face-to-face and online settings at the same time. Supported by the studies conducted by (Ljubin-Golub & Rijavec 2019; Felaza et al., 2020; Li, Shen & Li-fang 2014; and Zitter & Hoeve 2012), this study aims to shed light surrounding the factors of Academic Burnout during Hybrid learning of the College students from the University of Saint Louis-Tuguegarao. In this section, interpretations and findings related to the significant differences in the academic burnout of college students along the subscales of academic burnout, specifically, Emotional Exhaustion, Cynicism, and Academic Efficacy, when grouped according to their profiles, are discussed.

Levels of Academic Burnout as manifested by the College students

Results from the mean of the three subscales of academic burnout indicate that the students rated themselves highest on the emotional exhaustion subscale, followed by the subscale of academic efficacy and being averagely cynical towards academic burnout. These results mean that:

Students are most likely to feel emotionally exhausted and prone to become distant from their academic work and may come to hate their academic activities in the future. This has also been supported by (Lee et al., 2020; Paro et al., 2014), indicating that emotional exhaustion has always been considered the main component of academic burnout as having high emotional exhaustion predicts cynicism. Whereas high values for emotional exhaustion and cynicism and low values for academic efficacy were still considered consistent with academic burnout Obregon et al., (2020). The increased academic workload and cumulative

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

stress directly affect major intention change and indirectly impact academic satisfaction, academic achievement and willingness to continue graduate education (Atalayin et al., 2015).

Having average academic efficacy has a meaningful and direct effect on academic satisfaction and academic achievement, thus resulting in a willingness to continue learning (Atalayin et al., 2015). Giving meaningful support, motivation, and proper information about course material, in line with teachers giving sufficient feedback, are all linked to students' academic efficacy (Jagodics & Szabo, 2022). However, a study conducted by Atalayin et al. (2015), stated that students who are living away from their families are reported to have higher levels of reduced academic efficacy, thus having a direct effect on their academic satisfaction.

Students who are bombarded with continuous high demands of requirements despite being persistent in studying are prone to getting accustomed to having less control and autonomy over their studies (Aguayo et at., 2019; Jagodics & Szabo, 2022). Although it is evident that individual differences in academic engagement exist, the endless need to comprehend the given learning materials can exhaust an individual, leading to perceiving academic work as invaluable to their life, thus being cynical (Muaddi et al., 2023). This finding is also supported by the study conducted by Ketonen et al. (2016), stating that if a student feels that the curriculum and the way it is taught is not useful for their personal and career growth, disengage from their studies is most likely to happen to lead to worse academic performance and potential dropout.

Significant difference in the Academic Burnout of the Respondents when Grouped According to Profile

Findings show a significant difference in the students' academic burnout and cynicism when grouped according to Age, Year Level, and Number of Academic Units. This means that students in higher grades had higher burnout, and this may be because of learning pressures, internships, and employment, so their interest in learning diminishes, resulting in a higher burnout level. This was also supported by Boni et al. (2018), stating that third- and fourth-year students have higher levels of cynicism than the lower years due to academic difficulties and inadequate sleep and is indicated as the most important factor to impact academic burnout (Aguayo et al., 2019). This feeling seems to continue during the transition period as students are exposed to an even more loaded curriculum as they are transitioning into a higher level of work and are also finalizing graduation requirements (Obregon et al., 2020; Aguayo et al., 2019; Paro et al., 2014). Age may also influence the expression of burnout, as older the student are more likely to express their burnout (Obregon et al., 2020; Chunming et al., 2017) as they easily feel exhausted and have energy depletion (Muaddi et al., 2023). There is also a significant influence on the students' academic burnout and exhaustion when grouped according to Sex and Department. These results mean that students may come to hate their academic work in the future, and students who hate studying are prone to become distant from their academic work. The studies of (Aguyao et al., 2019; Chunming et al., 2017; Obregon et al., 2020; Paro et al., 2014) revealed that women are more likely to report emotional exhaustion and may be more likely to report burnout versus their male counter parts. This may be due to the high demand and the requirements and persistent studying to comprehend the given materials an individual might face regardless of their chosen field (Muaddi et al., 2023). Lastly, it also shows a significant difference in academic burnout and efficacy when grouped according to the Department. Students in the medical field, in particular, scored low in academic-efficacy due to excessive workload, challenging learning tasks, and frequent examinations, which affect their learning consciousness and cause psychological distress (Xu et al.,2023; Oyoo, et al., 2020). This finding was also supported by Kintu, et al. (2017), who stated that students in Social Education have higher levels of academic efficacy than students in other courses. This suggests that academic efficacy in social education students positively impacts their expectations about the activities they will perform, as well as their motivation and ability to complete tasks successfully.

In addition, findings show that the students who scored highest on cynicism were between the ages of 22 and 23, as compared with younger students between the ages of 17 and 19 and 20 and 21. Age was found to have a significant difference with cynicism, which significantly increased as the individual got older (Lee et al., 2013; Chunming, 2017). In comparison to their older counterparts in the age group 22–23, younger learners in the age range of 17–21 recorded significantly lower levels of cynicism (Oyoo et al., 2020). Students aged 22 to 24 have a higher risk of being cynical. One explanation for this may be that students who experience burnout syndrome early in their academic careers are more likely to drop out of school than those with a lower risk (Fiorilli, et al., 2022). In addition, Gabola et al. (2021) found that cynicism increases as students' progress through their educational trajectories in school. As students get older and advance through their academic careers and as the demands of schoolwork increase, they are more susceptible to academic burnout, stress, and depressive symptoms.

Findings show that female college students experienced higher levels of emotional exhaustion. These findings are consistent with prior studies where it is demonstrated that female students are more emotionally exhausted across education levels than male students (Fiorilli et al., 2022 & Asikainen et al., 2022). This is further supported by the findings from the study of Fiorilli et al. (2022), where it was revealed that there are higher levels of exhaustion and emotional and cognitive impairment in female

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

students than in male students. Another study found that, compared to boys, girls reported lower overall self-esteem and greater dependence on academic achievement. These negative self-worth patterns were linked to higher levels of exhaustion among female students (Widlund et al., 2021). Female students are also more likely to suffer from stress factors than male medical students, with more demands placed on the outside of the university (Kajjimu et al., 2021). Another study reveals that another reason why female students score significantly higher on exhaustion than their male counterparts is because they are reported to have higher levels of demands that cause stress, strain, and exhaustion, such as emotionally loaded situations; mentally challenging tasks; conflicts with superiors, colleagues, time pressure; and long working/studying hours (Jagodics & Szabó, 2022). Thus, this implies that female students have higher levels of emotional exhaustion, and therefore, according to the MBI-SS, students high in exhaustion are at higher risk of academic burnout.

Additionally, findings indicate that fourth-year students exhibit the highest levels of cynicism and that there is a substantial difference between first- and fourth-year students in terms of severe cynicism, suggesting that cynicism grows with the years of study (Miltojević et al., 2022; Liu,2018). The increasing degree of difficulty placed on the students as their year level increases causes high levels of academic burnout (Boni et al., 2018). Due to academic difficulties and sleep deprivation, fourth-year students exhibit more severe cynicism and feelings of inadequacy than students in lower years (Almalki, et al., 2017; Boni et al., 2018). Senior students, who are primarily enrolled in practical professional training this year and are getting close to the finish of their studies, concur that they are losing interest and motivation in their studies. The causes may be related to how studies are organized and the current state of society, particularly the challenges associated with finding employment in one's field (Miltojevi et al., 2022; Liu, 2018). Unlike third- and fourth-year students, freshmen mostly study basic knowledge, which is relatively easy, and they do not have to make pressing plans for their future careers. As a result, they displayed lower academic burnout, cynicism and greater academic efficacy than students in higher year levels (Felaza et al., 2022; Liu, 2018).

Moreover, findings show that the students in the School of Accountancy, Business and Hospitality department experience higher levels of Emotional Exhaustion than students from other departments. This implies that Business and Accountancy students experience higher levels of emotional exhaustion than students from other fields. In line with these findings, a study by Uy et al. (2014) revealed that accountancy students are at risk of academic burnout, and a significant difference exists between the burnout levels of Third year and Fourth-year accountancy students in the area of emotional exhaustion. Reasons that explain the emotional exhaustion of students in business and accountancy are the numerous requirements competing for their time (Ahmed & Uddin, 2019), the concern over meeting the cut-off grade, and the uncertainty of making it through the qualifying examinations or the retention policy. Moreover, higher levels of emotional exhaustion in students from the business and accountancy fields can also be related to having low emotional intelligence (Carson et al., 2016).

In the category of Academic Efficacy, where a higher mean indicates less academic efficacy, the School of Health and Allied Sciences department scored the highest score. This indicates that as compared to respondents from other departments, respondents from the School of Health and Allied Sciences had lower Academic Efficacy. It was found that during the pandemic, medical students' academic efficacy significantly decreased as a result of the disruption of regular learning and clinical practice, as well as from a heavy workload, difficult learning tasks, and frequent exams that have an impact on students' learning consciousness and academic self-efficacy (Xu et al., 2023; Morcos & Awan, 2022). Medical students lose motivation, enthusiasm, confidence, and efficacy when they believe they are unable to complete tasks, solve difficulties, or overcome challenges linked to their field of study (Rohmani & Andriani, 2021). Additionally, because medical school is an intense instructional setting, medical students are more prone than non-medical students to experience emotional distress (Yahya et al., 2021). In accordance with to study findings of (Xu et al., 2023; Yahya et al., 2021), higher levels of psychological distress have been shown to significantly diminish medical students' excitement and confidence in studying, making students look preoccupied and lessen learning efficiency, preventing them from attaining their learning goals. Lower levels of academic efficacy were linked to factors such as inadequate social support, depression, anxiety, stress, and the lack of effective coping mechanisms (Abreu et al., 2022). This finding further emphasizes the significance of academic efficacy for students studying health and sciences as it is essential for the development of problem-solving, decision-making, and clinical judgment skills. Furthermore, considering that medical information is always evolving, it is essential for students to acquire self-regulated learning skills (SRLS) so they can remain up-to date-throughout their life (Demirören et al., 2016).

In contrast to the findings of this study, multiple studies have found that workload, as measured by the number of units enrolled, is positively correlated with cynicism. This suggests that greater workloads or academic units increase students' cynicism. (Kachel et al., 2020; Velasco, 2019; Atalayin et al., 2015). However, Velasco (2019) concluded that subjective workload could be a factor in why students with fewer academic units may feel more cynical and exhausted than those with more workload. Subjective

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

workload, rather than objective workload, is more closely related to the three aspects of burnout; it is the feeling and belief that one's academic and extracurricular load is heavy, whereas objective workload is the actual load of academics. Furthermore, a lower workload can lead to cynicism when accompanied by exhaustion, depression, and negative feelings (Pala, 2012).

CONCLUSION

The finding of this study depicts an important implication presented by hybrid learning and its constant unpredictability. Students may become more prone to developing academic burnout. The results indicate that academic burnout among college students is frequent and severe, with the dimension of emotional exhaustion ranking the highest. The findings also demonstrate that female students experience greater mental exhaustion than their male counterparts. Comparatively speaking, the School of Accountancy, Business, and Hospitality has the highest emotional exhaustion rate. Additionally, fourth-year students, those with less than 10 units, and older students—more precisely, those between the ages of 24 and 26—scored higher on the cynicism scale. Additionally, compared to students from other departments, students from the School of Education Arts and Sciences department have the highest academic efficacy.

Following identifying these risk factors, specific actions must be taken to safeguard college students from academic burnout. One such action is developing a collaborative relationship between students, instructors, health experts, and school officials to decide on preventative measures and interventions. In addition to all of these results, the study had certain limitations. The study could not incorporate and analyze additional aspects like personality, physical, or psychological characteristics and instead concentrated on demographic data and profiles as potential contributors to academic burnout. Other than that, the researchers could not conduct a test-retest to confirm the reliability of the data from this study. In addition, because the study utilized the Maslach Burnout Inventory-SS, a self-report questionnaire, student responses may vary over time.

REFERENCES

1. Abreu Alves, S., Sinval, J., Lucas Neto, L. et al. Burnout and dropout intention in medical students: the protective role of academic engagement. *BMC Med Educ* 22, 83 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-021-03094-9
2. Aguayo, R., Cañadas, G. R., Assbaa-Kaddouri, L., Cañadas-De la Fuente, G. A., Ramírez-Baena, L., & Ortega-Campos, E. (2019). A Risk Profile of Sociodemographic Factors in the Onset of Academic Burnout Syndrome in a Sample of University Students. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 16(5), 707. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16050707
3. Ahmed, H., & Uddin, M. (2019). Burnout Among Business Students and Its Impact On Academic Performance.ResearchGate.*https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344946061*_Burnout_Among_Business_Students_and_Its_Impact_On_Academic_Performance
4. Almalki, S. A., Almojali, A. I., Alothman, A. S., Masuadi, E. M., & Alaqeel, M. K. (2017). Burnout and its association with extracurricular activities among medical students in Saudi Arabia. *International journal of medical education*, 8, 144. doi: 10.5116/ijme.58e3.ca8a
5. Asikainen, H., Nieminen, J. H., Häsä, J., & Katajavuori, N. (2022). University students' interest and burnout profiles and their relation to approaches to learning and achievement. Learning and Individual Differences, 93, 102105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2021.102105
6. Atalayin C, Balkis M, Tezel H, Onal B, Kayrak G. The prevalence and consequences of burnout on a group of preclinical dental students. Eur J Dent. 2015 Jul-Sep;9(3):356-363. doi: 10.4103/1305-7456.163227. PMID: 26430363; PMCID: PMC4569986.
7. Bonafé, F., Campos, J., & Maroco, J. (2014). Predictors of Burnout Syndrome in Dentistry Students. *In Psychology, Community & Health* (Vols. 3, Issues 3, pp. 120–130). https://doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.2268
8. Boni, R., Fregnani, J., Lucchetti, G., Oliveira, M., Paiva, C., & Paiva, S., (2018). Burnout among medical students during the first years of undergraduate school: Prevalence and associated factors. *PloS one*, 13(3), e0191746. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0191746
9. Carson, K. D., Carson, P. P., & Birkenmeier, B. J. (2016). Measuring emotional intelligence: Development and validation of an instrument. *Journal of Behavioral and applied Management, 2(1).*
10. Chunming, W.M., Harrison, R., MacIntyre, R. et al. Burnout in medical students: a systematic review of experiences in Chinese medical schools. *BMC Med Educ* 17, 217 (2017). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-017-1064-3
11. Demirören, M., Turan, S., & Öztuna, D. (2016). Medical students' self-efficacy in problem-based learning and its relationship with self-regulated learning. *Medical Education Online*, 21(1), 30049. https://doi.org/10.3402/meo.v21.30049

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

12. Felaza, E., Findyartini, A., Mustika, R. & Setyorini, D. (2020). How Motivation Correlates with Academic Burnout: Study Conducted in Undergraduate Medical Students. *Education in Medicine Journal, 12*(1). DOI:10.21315/eimj2020.12.1.5
13. Fiorilli, C., Barni, D., Russo, C. C., Marchetti, V. a. R., Angelini, G., & Romano, L. (2022). Students' Burnout at University: The Role of Gender and Worker Status. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(18), 11341. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph191811341
14. Gabola P, Meylan N, Hascoët M, De Stasio S, Fiorilli C. Adolescents' School Burnout: A Comparative Study between Italy and Switzerland. *Eur J Investig Health Psychol Educ*. 2021 Aug 11;11(3):849-859. doi: 10.3390/ejihpe11030062. PMID: 34563075; PMCID: PMC8544231
15. Idrizi, E., & Vladimir, S. (2022). *Hybrid Learning -the new normal.* Ilic I, Ilic M. Burnout Syndrome and Associated Sociodemographic Factors in Medical Students: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Biology and Life Sciences Forum*. 2021; 9(1):1. https://doi.org/10.3390/ECCM-10869
16. Jagodics, B., & Szabó, É. (2022). Student Burnout in Higher Education: A Demand-Resource Model Approach. *Trends in Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43076-021-00137-4
17. Kachel, T., Huber, A., Strecker, C., Höge, T., & Höfer, S. (2020). Development of cynicism in medical students: exploring the role of signature character strengths and well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11, 328.*
18. Kajjimu, J., Kaggwa, M. M., & Bongomin, F. (2021). Burnout and Associated Factors Among Medical Students in a Public University in Uganda: A Cross-Sectional Study. Advances in *Medical Education and Practice, Volume 12*, 63–75. https://doi.org/10.2147/amep.s287928
19. Ketonen, E. E., Haarala-Muhonen, A., Hirsto, L., Hänninen, J., Wähälä, K., & Lonka, K. (2016). Am I in the right place? Academic engagement and study success during the first years at university. *Learning and Individual Differences, 51, 141-148.*
20. Kintu, M. J., Zhu, C., & Kagambe, E. (2017). Blended learning effectiveness: the relationship between student characteristics, design features and outcomes. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 14(1), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-017-0043-4
21. Kochuchakkalackal Kuriala, G. (2021). Acculturation Stress, Covid-19 Outbreak, and Academic Burnout on the Psychological Well-being of Asian Students. *Journal of Research Initiatives, 5*(3), 15. https://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/jri/vol5/iss3/15
22. Lee, M., Lee, K.J., Lee, S.M., & Cho, S.H. (2020). From Emotional Exhaustion to Cynicism in Academic Burnout among Korean Highschool Students: Focusing on the Mediation Effects of Hatred of Academic Work. Stress and health: *journal of the International Society for the Investigation of Stress. https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.2936*
23. Li Ling, Shen Qin, Li-fang Shen. (2014). An investigation about learning burnout in medical college students and its influencing factors. *International Journal of Nursing Sciences. Volume 1*, Issue 1, Pages 117-120. ISSN 2352-0132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2014.02.005
24. Liu H, Yansane AI, Zhang Y, Fu H, Hong N, Kalenderian E. Burnout, and study engagement among medical students at Sun Yat-sen University, China: A cross-sectional study. *Medicine (Baltimore). 2018 Apr;97(15): e0326.* doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000010326. PMID: 29642167; PMCID: PMC5908607.
25. Liu, Y., & Cao, Z. (2022). The impact of social support and stress on academic burnout among medical students in online learning: The mediating role of resilience. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 10. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.938132
26. Ljubin-Golub, T.&Rijavec, M. (2019). Academic flow and burnout in college students: An eight-month longitudinal study. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences EpSBS*, 72, 16-27. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2019.11.2
27. Makhachashvili, R.& Semenist, I. (2021). Student satisfaction with digital hybrid learning in European and oriental languages programs: survey study of regional universities of Ukraine. *In Proceedings of the 19th International Conference E-society* (pp. 133-143).
28. Miltojević, V., IlićKrstić, I., &Orlić, A. (2022). Burnout Among Students of Technical Faculties in Serbia – A Case Study. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education (IJCRSEE), 10*(2), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.23947/2334-8496-2022-10-2-219-229
29. Muaddi, M. A., El-Setouhy, M., Alharbi, A. A., Makeen, A. M., Adawi, E. A., Gohal, G., & Alqassim, A. Y. (2023). Assessment of Medical Students Burnout during COVID-19 Pandemic. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 20(4), 3560. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043560
30. Obregon, M., Luo, J., Shelton, J. et al. (2020). Assessment of burnout in medical students using the Maslach Burnout Inventory-Student Survey: a cross-sectional data analysis. *BMC Med Educ 20, 376*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02274-3

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen

31. Oyoo, S., Mwaura, P., Kinai, T., & Mutua, J. (2020). Academic burnout and academic achievement among secondary school students in Kenya. *Education Research International, 2020*.; New York Vol. 2020, DOI:10.1155/2020/5347828
32. Pala, A. (2012). The burnout level among faculty of education students at Celal Bayar University. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 69, 1766-1774.
33. Paro, H. B., Silveira, P. S., Perotta, B., Gannam, S., Enns, S. C., Giaxa, R. R., Bonito, R. F., Martins, M. A., & Tempski, P. Z. (2014). Empathy among medical students: is there a relation with quality of life and burnout? *PloS one, 9(4),* e94133. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094133
34. Rahmatpour, P., Chehrzad, M., Ghanbari, A., & Sadat-Ebrahimi, S. R. (2019). Academic burnout as an educational complication and promotion barrier among undergraduate students: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 8. DOI: 10.4103/jehp.jehp_165_19
35. Rohmani, N., & Andriani, R. (2021). Correlation between academic self-efficacy and burnout originating from distance learning among nursing students in Indonesia during the coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic. *Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions,* 18, 9. https://doi.org/10.3352/jeehp.2021.18.9
36. Sanpanich, N. (2021). Investigating Factors Affecting Students' Attitudes toward Hybrid Learning. *REFLections*, *28(*2), 208-227. https://so05.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/reflections/article/view/253093
37. Shimkovich, E., Makhmutova, G., Ivanova, D., & Urunova, R. (2022). Advantages and Disadvantages of Hybrid Learning for International Students. *ARPHA Proceedings*, 5, 1533-1544. https://doi.org/10.3897/ap.5.e1533
38. Velasco, J. C. (2019). Millennials in the University: An Inquiry on Burnout among Filipino University Students. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 27(2).
39. Widlund, A., Tuominen, H., & Korhonen, J. (2021). Development of school engagement and burnout across lower and upper secondary education: Trajectory profiles and educational outcomes. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 66, 101997. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.101997
40. Ye, Y., Huang, X., & Liu, Y. (2021). Social Support and Academic Burnout Among University Students: A Moderated Mediation Model. *Psychology research and behavior management*, 14, 335–344. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S300797
41. Zitter, I., &Hoeve, A. (2012). Hybrid Learning Environments: Merging Learning and Work Processes to Facilitate Knowledge Integration and Transitions. *OECD Education Working Papers*, No. 81. OECD Publishing (NJ1). https://doi.org/10.1787/19939019

Corresponding Author: Darin Jan Tindowen