International Journal of Education, Vocational and Social Science
https://e-journal.citakonsultindo.or.id/index.php/IJEVSS
E-ISSN : 2963 4954
IJEVSS

Analysis Of Academic Burnout Among Working College Students: A Perspective On Self-Efficacy And Academic Stress

Liyana Putri Elbatrisyia[1]
Faculty of Psychology, Muria Kudus University, Indonesia[1]
Ahmad Faqihuddin[2]
Faculty of Psychology, Muria Kudus University, Indonesia[2]

Corresponding Author: 202260045@std.umk.ac.id

Abstract

This study examined the relationship between self-efficacy and academic stress with academic burnout among working undergraduate students. A quantitative correlational research design was used. Data were collected using three Likert-scale psychological instruments administered to 370 active working students selected via purposive sampling. Data analysis was conducted using multiple linear regression and Pearson product-moment correlation. The findings revealed a significant simultaneous relationship between self-efficacy and academic stress with academic burnout (F = 56.804, p = 0.000), contributing 19.1% to the variance of academic burnout. Partially, self-efficacy demonstrated a significant negative relationship with academic burnout (r = -0.057, p = 0.000), indicating that higher self-efficacy was linked to lower burnout. Conversely, academic stress showed a significant positive relationship with academic burnout (r = 0.031, p = 0.000), meaning that greater academic stress predicted higher burnout. In conclusion, both internal personal resources and external academic demands simultaneously determined the level of academic burnout in working students. High self-efficacy functioned as a protective asset, whereas unmanaged academic stress significantly aggravated the risk of developing psychological and emotional exhaustion.

Keywords: academic burnout, academic stress, self-efficacy, working students

INTRODUCTION

Academic burnout represents a chronic psychological condition experienced by university students resulting from prolonged academic pressures. Schaufeli et al. (2002) characterized academic burnout through three distinct dimensions: emotional exhaustion, a cynical attitude

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

toward university activities, and a diminished sense of academic accomplishment. This paradigm was expanded by Maslach and Leiter (2016), who asserted that burnout severely impairs not only personal psychological well-being but also directly diminishes engagement and functional performance within one's primary institutional roles, including that of a student.

Empirically, this phenomenon is widely documented. A large-scale survey conducted by the American College Health Association across 54,322 university students in the United States revealed that 74% of respondents experienced moderate-to-high levels of emotional exhaustion due to academic stressors. This aligns with findings by Xie et al. (2022), which examined over 32,145 students and indicated that more than half suffered from moderate-to-high academic burnout. Within the Indonesian education context, data from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (2021) showed that approximately 74.40% of higher education graduates secure employment relatively quickly, reinforcing a strong career orientation during their undergraduate years. Consequently, many students are compelled to work while studying to bolster their competitiveness , manage economic constraints, handle rising tuition costs, or achieve financial independence. Global data from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2022) confirms that more than half of higher education students participate in paid part-time or full-time employment during their academic tenure.

The practical reality of managing dual roles leads to severe temporal and energetic strain. Working students are highly susceptible to work-study role conflicts, which sharply intensify academic stress and mental fatigue. Reports from Kumparan.com (2023) further highlighted an escalation in mental exhaustion among students coping with simultaneous dual-role expectations. Robotham (2012) established that working students encounter higher academic exhaustion due to difficulties in balancing occupational commitments with academic workloads, revealing that paid employment correlates with increased emotional exhaustion and diminished educational participation. Similarly, Salmela-Aro and Upadyaya (2014) indicated that working students are particularly vulnerable to emotional exhaustion and reduced academic efficacy. Dyrbye et al. (2014) observed that high academic demands unmet by adequate psychological recovery systematically accelerate burnout development over time.

Theoretically, an ideal higher education environment provides balanced institutional demands and supportive resources, allowing students to achieve optimal engagement and psychological health without excessive exhaustion. However, empirical evidence demonstrates a substantial research gap: while previous studies analyzed components like coping strategies and optimism (e.g., Vizoso et al., 2019) or individual characteristics and emotional support (e.g.,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Romano et al., 2021) in the general student populace, very few focused explicitly on the dual-role working student population. Furthermore, prior investigations regularly isolated self-efficacy as a mediator or moderator rather than evaluating it simultaneously alongside academic stress as a direct predictor of burnout. This study addresses this gap by examining the urgent interplay of internal psychological factors (self-efficacy) and external pressures (academic stress) within the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) framework.

These narratives show that academic stress does not lead to burnout linearly; rather, it is dictated by how an individual appraises and handles demands , where chronic stress erodes initial self-efficacy over time. According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy represents an individual's belief in their capacity to execute actions required to achieve specific performance levels. High academic self-efficacy promotes self-regulation, persistence, and resilience , acting as a robust protective asset against burnout dimensions like emotional exhaustion and cynicism. Conversely, low self-efficacy increases academic anxiety and accelerates emotional depletion. Concurrently, academic stress—defined as a psychological reaction when academic demands exceed available personal coping resources —shows strong empirical links to high emotional exhaustion and cynicism among students , particularly those enduring thesis pressures or working dual roles. Given that academic burnout is closely linked to critical outcomes such as severe mental health issues, poor performance, and institutional dropout , evaluating self-efficacy and academic stress simultaneously provides essential insights into working students' psychological adaptation. This formed the foundation for the current study, titled "Analysis of Academic Burnout Among Working College Students: A Perspective on Self-Efficacy and Academic Stress".

RESEARCH METHODS

This study utilized a quantitative correlational research design to examine the predictive relationships between the independent variables self-efficacy (X1) and academic stress (X2) and the dependent variable, academic burnout (Y). This design is well-suited for evaluating the simultaneous and individual contributions of internal psychological resources and external environmental demands within a non-experimental framework. The structural approach aimed to clarify the predictive power of these variables within the specific population of interest.

Population, Sample, and Sampling Technique

The target population for this study consisted of all active undergraduate students who were concurrently engaged in paid employment at Universitas Muria Kudus. From this population,

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

a sample of 404 working students was selected using a purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling was used to ensure that all selected participants met the specified criteria necessary to address the research questions. The explicit inclusion criteria required that participants were: (a) actively enrolled undergraduate students at Universitas Muria Kudus, and (b) concurrently employed in either a part-time or full-time capacity during the active academic semester.

Research Variables and Operational Definitions

The study operationalized three core variables: academic burnout, self-efficacy, and academic stress. Academic burnout (Y) is conceptually defined as a continuous multidimensional psychological syndrome resulting from prolonged exposure to chronic academic pressures, characterized by physical and emotional exhaustion, an uncaring or detached stance toward one's studies, and feelings of inadequacy as a student (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Salmela-Aro & Upadyaya, 2014). Operationally, academic burnout was measured via an adapted psychological scale based on the three core dimensions established by Schaufeli and Bakker (2017): exhaustion (the depletion of mental and physical energy under academic strain), cynicism (the development of an indifferent, detached, or negative attitude toward university work), and reduced academic efficacy (perceived incompetence and diminished achievement in one's academic role). Higher total scores on this scale indicate higher levels of academic burnout.

Self-efficacy (X1) is conceptually defined as an individual's subjective belief in their capability to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to successfully execute tasks, overcome challenges, and achieve desired performance outcomes within a given domain (Bandura, 1997; Pajares, 2016). Operationally, self-efficacy was assessed using a psychometric scale developed around Bandura's (1997) three structural dimensions: level (the perceived difficulty of tasks an individual believes they can perform), strength (the resilience and firmness of the belief to persist despite obstacles), and generality (the extent to which these efficacy beliefs transfer across different situations). Higher cumulative scores represent stronger beliefs in personal capability.

Academic stress (X2) is conceptually defined as a subjective psychological experience of tension or pressure that occurs when perceived academic demands exceed an individual's adaptive coping capabilities (Salanova et al., 2019). Operationally, academic stress was evaluated using an adapted scale based on the Educational Stress Scale for Adolescents (ESSA) framework developed by Sun et al. (2011). This scale captures five dimensions of stress: pressure from study (burden from daily learning demands), workload (cognitive strain from assignments), worry about

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

grades (anxiety over evaluations), self-expectation (internal standards for achievement), and despondency (feelings of hopelessness regarding academic performance). Higher scores reflect greater experienced academic stress.

Research Instruments and Scaling System

Data collection relied on three psychometric scales structured around a 4-point Likert response format to eliminate neutral response bias and enhance measurement precision (Azwar, 2022). Each scale included both favorable items (phrased to support the measured construct) and unfavorable items (phrased in reverse). Favorable items were scored as 4 (Sangat Sesuai/Strongly Agree), 3 (Sesuai/Agree), 2 (Tidak Sesuai/Disagree), and 1 (Sangat Tidak Sesuai/Strongly Disagree). For unfavorable items, the scoring was reversed: 1 (Sangat Sesuai), 2 (Sesuai), 3 (Tidak Sesuai), and 4 (Sangat Tidak Sesuai).

The Self-Efficacy Scale originally comprised 36 initial items before psychometric evaluation, with an even distribution of 18 favorable and 18 unfavorable items split equally across its three aspects (12 items per aspect). The initial blueprint allocated items as follows: Level (Favorable: 2, 8, 14, 20, 26, 32; Unfavorable: 5, 11, 17, 23, 29, 35); Strength (Favorable: 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, 31; Unfavorable: 4, 10, 16, 22, 28, 34); and Generality (Favorable: 3, 9, 15, 21, 27, 33; Unfavorable: 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36). The Academic Stress Scale was constructed by adapting the ESSA framework, initially containing 40 items designed to measure the five target dimensions. The Academic Burnout Scale was adapted from the MBI-SS to evaluate exhaustion, cynicism, and reduced efficacy among working students.

Validity and Reliability Testing

To ensure instrument quality, a preliminary psychometric tryout was conducted. Item validity was assessed using a corrected item-total correlation analysis (rix) via an item analysis framework. Items with a corrected item-total correlation coefficient below the threshold of 0.300 were considered weak and excluded from the final instrument, while items exceeding 0.300 were retained. For the Self-Efficacy Scale, the first round of evaluation identified 34 valid items with coefficients ranging from 0.311 to 0.774. Two items from the Generality dimension (V33 and V36) fell below the threshold (coefficients between 0.141 and 0.276) and were removed. A second-round analysis confirmed that a 34 remaining items were valid (coefficients between 0.311 and 0.774), resulting in a final blueprint of 17 favorable and 17 unfavorable items. The valid item distributions for the final Self-Efficacy Scale were: Level (12 items), Strength (12 items), and

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Generality (10 items). Reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha (α\alpha) coefficients to confirm the internal consistency of each instrument.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Data collection was systematically carried out by distributing the psychometric instruments to working students who met the inclusion criteria. Participants completed the survey after receiving an explanation of the research purpose and confirming their voluntary consent.

Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software. Prior to hypothesis testing, standard statistical assumptions were checked, including tests for normality, linearity, and multicollinearity, to verify that the data met the requirements for linear modeling. The primary hypotheses were tested using multiple linear regression analysis. This statistical method evaluated the simultaneous predictive power of self-efficacy (X1) and academic stress (X2) on the dependent variable, academic burnout (Y). It also calculated the coefficient of determination (R2) to determine the proportion of variance in academic burnout explained by the predictors, utilizing a standard significance threshold of $p < 0.05.

RESEARCH RESULT

This study involved 404 working students as respondents. The majority of respondents were aged 20–24 years (289 people) (71.5%), male (213 people) (52.7%), from the Faculty of Economics and Business (126 people) (31.2%), and freelance (148 people) (36.6%).

Table 1. Categorization of Academic Burnout, Self-Efficacy, and Academic Stress Variables

Variables	Category	Amount (F)	Percentage (%)
Academic Burnout	Very Low	11	2.72%
	Low	28	6.93%
	Currently	271	67.08%
	Tall	88	21.78%
	Very high	6	1.49%
Self-Efficacy	Very Low	4	0.99%
	Low	30	7.43%

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Variables	Category	Amount (F)	Percentage (%)
	Currently	267	66.09%
	Tall	103	25.49%
	Very high	0	0.00%
Academic Stress	Very Low	17	4.21%
	Low	23	5.69%
	Currently	278	68.81%
	Tall	82	20.30%
	Very high	4	0.99%

Based on the categorization results, the three research variables showed a relatively similar distribution pattern with respondents dominating in the moderate category . In the academic burnout variable, 271 respondents (67.08%) were in the moderate category, followed by the high category of 88 respondents (21.78%), low as many as 28 respondents (6.93%), very low as many as 11 respondents (2.72%), and very high as many as 6 respondents (1.49%). These results indicate that the level of academic burnout of working students tends to be at a moderate level.

In the self-efficacy variable, the majority of respondents were also in the moderate category (267 respondents (66.09%), followed by the high category (103 respondents (25.49%), low (30 respondents (7.43%), very low (4 respondents (0.99%), while there were no respondents in the very high category (0.00%). This condition indicates that the level of self-confidence of working students is generally in the moderate category.

Meanwhile, the academic stress variable showed a nearly identical distribution pattern, dominated by the moderate category with 278 respondents (68.81%), followed by the high category with 82 respondents (20.30%), low with 23 respondents (5.69%), very low with 17 respondents (4.21%), and very high with 4 respondents (0.99%). Overall, the categorization results indicate that academic burnout, self-efficacy, and academic stress in working students tend to be at a moderate level.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Table 2. Results of Linearity Test of Relationships Between Variables

Variable Relationship	F value	Significance (p)	Information
Academic Burnout – Self-Efficacy	1,465	0.111	Linear
Academic Burnout – Academic Stress	1,101	0.304	Linear

The results of the linearity test show that the relationship between self-efficacy and academic burnout has a Deviation from Linearity value of F = 1.465 with p = 0.111 , while the relationship between academic stress and academic burnout obtained F = 1.101 with p = 0.304 . Both significance values are above 0.05 (p > 0.05), so it can be concluded that the relationship between each independent variable and academic burnout meets the linearity assumption and is worthy of further analysis using regression analysis.

Table 3. Partial Hypothesis Testing Results

Independent Variable (X)	Correlation Coefficient (r)	Significance (p)	Effective Contribution (SE %)	Information
Self-Efficacy	-0.057	0,000	5.7%	Significant negative relationship
Academic Stress	0.031	0,000	17.6%	Significant positive relationship

The results of partial hypothesis testing indicate that self-efficacy has a significant negative relationship with academic burnout , indicated by a correlation coefficient of r = -0.057 with a significance value of p = 0.000 (p < 0.05) . These findings indicate that the higher the self-efficacy of working students, the lower the level of academic burnout they experience. The self-efficacy variable provides an effective contribution of 5.7% to the variation in academic burnout.

In contrast, academic stress has a significant positive relationship with academic burnout , with a correlation coefficient of r = 0.031 and a significance value of p = 0.000 (p < 0.05) . These results indicate that the higher the level of academic stress experienced by working students, the higher the perceived academic burnout. The academic stress variable provides an effective contribution of 17.6% to the variation in academic burnout. Thus, both minor hypotheses in this

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

study are declared accepted.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to examine the relationship between *self-efficacy* and academic stress with academic *burnout* in working students. Based on the results of the regression analysis in the major hypothesis testing table, it is known that all research hypotheses, both major and minor hypotheses, are significantly proven. The results of the multiple regression analysis in show that *self-efficacy* and academic stress together have a significant relationship with academic *burnout* in working students (p = 0.000). This indicates that both predictor variables are strong enough to explain variations in students' physical and mental fatigue in completing their lecture and work responsibilities, by providing an effective contribution of 19.1%. This combination of influences is in line with the theoretical framework of *the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model* developed by Bakker and Demerouti (2017), which states that *burnout* occurs due to an imbalance between *demands and* resources .

In the context of working students, academic stress acts as a demanding burden that drains psychological energy, while *self-efficacy* serves as a crucial internal personal resource for resilience. Empirical research by Rahmati (2015) and Vizoso et al. (2019) confirms that the interaction between low self-confidence and high academic pressure is a very strong linear predictor in triggering massive study burnout. This is reinforced by Salanova et al. (2010) who asserted that when students lose optimism about their own capabilities amidst mounting work demands, the process of mental erosion (*burnout*) will accelerate significantly.

The results of the first minor hypothesis test in show that *self-efficacy* has a significant negative relationship with academic *burnout* (r = -0.057; p = 0.000). Thus, an individual's belief in their ability to complete academic tasks is proven to be directly and inversely related to the level of student learning saturation, where the higher *the self-efficacy* , the lower the academic *burnout* experienced with an effective contribution of 5.7%. This finding is consistent with research by Wang et al. (2024) who found that *academic self-efficacy* is a significant negative predictor of academic burnout in students. Students who have high confidence in their academic abilities tend to be better able to maintain learning motivation, face academic difficulties, and manage the pressures that arise during the learning process.

The results of this study also align with those of Orpina and Prahara (2019), who specifically examined working students and found a significant negative relationship between academic *self-efficacy* and academic burnout. Similar findings were also obtained by Luthfia and Laily (2021),

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

who showed that *academic self-efficacy* negatively impacted academic *burnout* in working engineering students.

According to Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory, individuals who have high confidence in their abilities will view difficult tasks as challenges to be overcome, rather than threats. These individuals tend to demonstrate greater persistence, better self-regulation, and the ability to use effective problem-solving strategies when faced with academic obstacles. Conversely, individuals with low *self-efficacy* are more likely to feel inadequate, give up quickly, and experience emotional distress when faced with challenging academic demands.

Furthermore, the results of the second minor hypothesis test in show that academic stress has a significant positive relationship with academic *burnout* ($r = 0.031$; $p = 0.000$). This means that the pressure, demands, and burden of intensive study are directly proportional to the increase in psychological tension and long-term student burnout, with a dominant contribution of 17.6%. These results support the theory proposed by Pascoe et al. (2020) that continuous exposure to academic stress can lead to various psychological problems, including academic burnout.

Lin and Huang (2014) found that stress experienced by students is closely related to increased emotional exhaustion and cynicism, the main components of burnout. This finding is also supported by Salanova et al. (2010), who explained that high academic demands can increase burnout and decrease student learning engagement. Research by Aprillia and Affandi (2025) shows that working students are vulnerable to academic stress because they have to divide their time and energy between work and study demands. This condition causes the individual's psychological resources to be depleted, increasing the likelihood of academic burnout.

Based on the results of the data categorization analysis in, it is known that the academic *burnout variable* for most respondents is in the moderate category, namely 245 respondents (60.64%), followed by the high category of 123 respondents (30.45%), the low category of 34 respondents (8.42%), and the very low category of 2 respondents (0.50%). This finding indicates that academic *burnout* is a fairly latent psychological condition and is experienced at moderate to high levels by the majority of working students. The high level of academic burnout found in this study is in line with the characteristics of working students who have to face dual roles, making them vulnerable to emotional exhaustion due to the division of energy between the world of work and lectures. The results of this study are in line with research by Stevani et al. (2025) who found that the majority of working students are in the moderate to high academic burnout category. This study shows that working students are vulnerable to academic exhaustion because they have

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

to meet academic and work demands simultaneously.

Aini and Sulaiman (2024) reported that most working final-year students experienced moderate academic burnout. This indicates that academic burnout is a fairly common phenomenon among working students.

In the *self-efficacy variable* based, the majority of respondents were in the moderate category, namely 267 respondents (66.09%), followed by the high category with 103 respondents (25.49%), the low category with 30 respondents (7.43%), and the very low category with 4 respondents (0.99%). These results indicate that the respondents' self-confidence was at a moderate level, where they were quite confident in their academic capacity but still needed stable coping regulations to avoid wavering when the burden of lecture assignments increased. These results are in line with Bandura's (1997) view that explains that self-efficacy is an individual's belief in their ability to organize the actions necessary to achieve certain goals. The high proportion of the moderate category indicates that working students generally still have confidence that they are able to complete academic and work demands simultaneously, although in certain situations this confidence can decrease when facing greater pressure.

Zhao et al. (2024) found that self-efficacy is a crucial psychological resource that helps students maintain academic performance and adapt to educational demands. Research by Pratama and Yuwono (2025) also showed that working students with higher self-efficacy tend to be better able to cope with work-study conflicts and have lower levels of burnout.

Meanwhile, in the academic stress variable based on table 4.16, the majority of respondents were in the moderate category, namely 278 respondents (68.81%), followed by the high category with 82 respondents (20.30%), the low category with 23 respondents (5.69%), the very low category with 17 respondents (4.21%), and the very high category with 4 respondents (0.99%). This condition indicates that the academic pressure felt by students is at a generally normal level, but the accumulation of moderate stress combined with daily workloads still has the potential to be a major trigger that increases academic *burnout* if not balanced with strong *self-efficacy* . This finding is in line with Pascoe et al. (2020) who stated that academic stress is one of the main sources of psychological stress in students. Continuous academic pressure can affect mental health, psychological well-being, and the quality of the student learning process. In addition, Lin and Huang (2014) found that academic stress has a strong relationship with the emergence of emotional exhaustion and academic burnout in students.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the data analysis and discussion in this study, it can be concluded that there is a significant simultaneous relationship between self-efficacy and academic stress with academic burnout in working students. The combination of reduced self-confidence and high academic pressure is proven to be the main driving factor that triggers massive learning burnout in students who carry out dual roles. Partially, this study proves a significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and academic burnout, which means that the higher the level of self-confidence students have in completing their tasks, the lower the level of academic burnout they feel. Conversely, a significant positive relationship was also found between academic stress and academic burnout, where increased pressure and unmanaged study load directly has the potential to increase the risk of physical, mental, and emotional exhaustion among working students.

REFERENCES

Agustina, R. (2019). Stres akademik pada mahasiswa: Konsep dan implikasi. *Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan Indonesia, 8*(1), 45–53.

Aini, N., & Sulaiman. (2024). *Gambaran Academic Burnout Mahasiswa Tingkat Akhir yang Bekerja*. Journal of Public Health Science. https://journal.ppmi.web.id/index.php/jophs/article/view/1181

American College Health Association. (2022). *National College Health Assessment III: Undergraduate student reference group executive summary spring 2022*. https://www.acha.org/documents/ncha/NCHA-III_SPRING_2022_UNDERGRADUATE_REFERENCE_GROUP_EXECUTIVE_SUMMARY.pdf

American College Health Association. (2023). *National college health assessment*

Aprillia, R. A., & Affandi, G. R. (2025). *Self Efficacy and Self Awareness in Working Student Academic Stress*. Academia Open. https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.10.2025.9539

Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik* (Rev. ed.). Rineka Cipta.

Azwar, S. (2017). *Metode penelitian psikologi* (2nd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.

Azwar, S. (2022). *Penyusunan skala psikologi* (3rd ed.). Pustaka Pelajar.

Bakker, A. B., & de Vries, J. D. (2021). Job demands–resources theory and self-regulation: New explanations and remedies for job burnout. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 34*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615806.2020.1797695

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). *Job Demands–Resources Theory: Taking Stock and Looking Forward*. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22(3), 273–285.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

https://doi.org/10.1037/ocp0000056

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman. https://books.google.com/books?id=eJ-PN9g_o-EC

Bedewy, D., & Gabriel, A. (2015). Examining perceptions of academic stress and its sources among university students: The Perception of Academic Stress Scale. *Health Psychology Open, 2*(2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/2055102915596714

Bresó, E., Salanova, M., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2018). In search of the "third dimension" of burnout: Efficacy or inefficacy? *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 57*(1), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00290.x

Butler, A. B. (2022). Combining employment and full-time study: A review of role strain and well-being outcomes. *Journal of American College Health, 70*(6), 1691–1700. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2020.1841770

Chung, E., Turnbull, D., & Chur-Hansen, A. (2020). Differences in resilience between "traditional" and "non-traditional" university students. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 21*(1), 77–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418791441

Creed, P. A., French, J., & Hood, M. (2015). Working while studying at university: The relationship between work benefits and demands and engagement and well-being. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 86*, 48–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2014.11.002

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Curtis, S., & Shani, N. (2002). The effect of taking paid employment during term-time on students' academic studies. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 26*(2), 129–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770220129406

Dyrbye, L. N., Thomas, M. R., & Shanafelt, T. D. (2014). Medical student distress: Causes, consequences, and proposed solutions. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings, 89*(12), 1613–1622. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2014.08.012

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Fadillah, N., & Sawitri, D. R. (2021). Hubungan antara stres akademik dengan burnout akademik pada mahasiswa tingkat akhir. *Jurnal Psikologi, 18*(2), 123–135.

Feldman, R. S. (2019). *Understanding psychology* (14th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

Gan, Y., Shang, J., & Zhang, Y. (2007). Coping flexibility and locus of control as predictors of burnout

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

among Chinese college students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 35*(8), 1087–1098. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2007.35.8.1087

García-Ros, R., Pérez-González, F., & Hinojosa, E. (2018). Academic stress in first-year college students. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 15*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15020216

Gurung, R. A. R. (2020). *Health psychology: A cultural approach* (5th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2020). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.

III: Undergraduate student reference group executive summary spring 2023. American College Health Association.

Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Laporan kinerja Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi 2023*. https://kemendikbud.go.id

Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2021). *Statistik pendidikan tinggi Indonesia*. Kemendikbudristek.

Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2021). *Laporan kinerja Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi tahun 2021*. Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.

Kumparan. (2023). *Kuliah sambil kerja: Realita baru mahasiswa Indonesia*. Kumparan Media Network. https://kumparan.com

Kumparan. (2025, Juni 4). *Kuliah sambil bekerja: Antara ambisi dan keseimbangan hidup*. https://kumparan.com/nadiafhafiz1403/kuliah-sambil-bekerja-antara-ambisi-dan-keseimbangan-hidup-25B1jY1LCTF

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.

Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (2016). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing Company.

Leiter, M. P., & Maslach, C. (2016). *Burnout at work: A psychological perspective*. Psychology Press.

Lesener, T., Gusy, B., & Wolter, C. (2020). The job demands–resources model: A meta-analytic review of longitudinal studies. *Work & Stress, 34*(4), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2020.1804994

Lestari, S. A., & Putri, D. K. (2024). *The measurement of job stress levels on study concentration in students who study while working (Case study: Gunadarma University postgraduate students)*. Jurnal Rekayasa Sistem Industri, 13(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.26593/jrsi.v13i2.7773.1-16

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Lin, S. H., & Huang, Y. C. (2019). Life stress and academic burnout. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 20*(1), 77–90. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417733903

Luthfia, R., Laily, N., & Sholichah, I. F. (2021). *The Effect of Academic Self-Efficacy on Academic Burnout on Engineering Students Who Work*. https://doi.org/10.30587/umgeshic.v1i2.3383

Madigan, D. J., & Curran, T. (2021). Does burnout affect academic achievement? A meta-analysis of over 100,000 students. *Educational Psychology Review, 33*, 387–405. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-020-09533-1

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). *Burnout*. Wiley Encyclopedia of Management. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118785317.weom110161

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2018). Job burnout: New directions in research and intervention. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5*, 397–422. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-032117-104644

May, R. W., Bauer, K. N., & Fincham, F. D. (2015). School burnout: Diminished academic and cognitive performance. *Learning and Individual Differences, 42*, 126–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.07.015

Misra, R., & McKean, M. (2000). College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management, and leisure satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Studies, 16*(1), 41–51.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *Education at a glance 2022: OECD indicators*. https://doi.org/10.1787/3197152b-en

Orpina, S., & Prahara, S. A. (2019). *Self-Efficacy dan Burnout Akademik pada Mahasiswa yang Bekerja*. https://doi.org/10.30653/001.201932.93

Pajares, F. (2016). Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings. *Review of Educational Research, 66*(4), 543–578.

Pascoe, M. C., Hetrick, S. E., & Parker, A. G. (2020). The impact of stress on students in secondary school and higher education. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 25*(1), 104–112. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673843.2019.1596823

Pratama, M. R., & Yuwono, I. (2025). *The Influence of Work Study Conflict, Self-Efficacy, and Social Support on Academic Burnout Among Working Students*. https://ojs.uph.edu/index.php/NCBMA/article/view/11321

Pratama, M. R., & Yuwono, I. (2025). *The Influence of Work Study Conflict, Self-Efficacy, and Social Support on Academic Burnout Among Working Students*.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

https://ojs.uph.edu/index.php/NCBMA/article/view/11321

Putri, A. R., & Handayani, S. (2023). Stres akademik dan burnout pada mahasiswa pekerja. *Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan, 12*(1), 45–56.

Rahayu, A., & Arianti, R. (2020). Konflik peran kerja–kuliah dan dampaknya terhadap stres akademik mahasiswa bekerja. *Jurnal Psikologi Pendidikan dan Perkembangan, 9*(2), 85–97.

Rahmati, Z. (2015). The study of academic burnout in relation with self-efficacy and academic alienation. *International Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9(3), 267–273. http://www.behavsci.ir/article_14890.html

Ramadhani, A., & Putri, M. A. (2022). Self-efficacy dan burnout akademik pada mahasiswa yang bekerja. *Jurnal Psikologi Teori dan Terapan, 13*(2), 89–101.

Robotham, D. (2012). Student part-time employment: Characteristics and consequences. *Education + Training, 54*(1), 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911211198804

Romano, L., Tang, X., Hietajärvi, L., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2021). Students' trait emotional intelligence and perceived teacher emotional support in preventing burnout. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.641923

Salanova, M., Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., & Bresó, E. (2019). How obstacles and facilitators predict academic performance: The mediating role of study burnout and engagement. *Anxiety, Stress, & Coping, 33*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/10615800802609965

Salmela-Aro, K., & Upadyaya, K. (2020). School burnout and engagement in the context of demands–resources model. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 17*(6), 943–960. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2019.1586613

Sarafino, E. P., & Smith, T. W. (2017). *Health psychology: Biopsychosocial interactions* (9th ed.). Wiley.

Sari, L., & Nugraha, A. (2021). Peran self-efficacy terhadap burnout akademik mahasiswa. *Jurnal Psikologi Indonesia, 10*(2), 150–162.

Schaufeli, W. B. (2017). Applying the job demands–resources model: A 'how to' guide to measuring and tackling work engagement and burnout. *Organizational Dynamics, 46*(2), 120–132.

Schaufeli, W. B., De Witte, H., & Desart, S. (2020). Manual Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT). KU Leuven.

Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(5), 464–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005003

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License

Schaufeli, W. B., Martínez, I. M., Pinto, A. M., Salanova, M., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). Burnout and engagement in university students: A cross-national study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*(5), 464–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033005003

Schunk, D. H. (2017). *Learning theories: An educational perspective* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Schunk, D. H., & DiBenedetto, M. K. (2020). *Motivation and Social Cognitive Theory*. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2019.101832

Stevani, H., Oktasari, M., Wahyudin, H., Pohan, R. A., & Yulia, C. (2025). *Academic Burnout of Students Working in Metropolitan Cities: Rasch Model Analysis*. Jurnal Keilmuan Pendidikan, 1(1), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.63203/040919000

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2021). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (2nd ed.). Alfabeta.

Sun, J., Dunne, M. P., Hou, X., & Xu, A. (2011). Educational stress scale for adolescents: Development, validity, and reliability with Chinese students. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 29*(6), 534–546. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734282910394976

Vizoso, C., Arias-Blanco, O., & Rodríguez, C. (2019). Exploring the profile of resilient student: Academic burnout, coping strategies, and self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00289

Vizoso, C., Arias-Gundín, O., & Rodríguez, C. (2019). Exploring coping and optimism as predictors of academic burnout. *European Journal of Education and Psychology, 12*(2), 131–148. https://doi.org/10.30552/ejep.v12i2.287

Walburg, V. (2019). Burnout among high school students: A literature review. *Children and Youth Services Review, 42*, 28–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.03.020

Wang, X. C., Zhang, M., & Wang, J. X. (2024). *The Effect of University Students' Academic Self-Efficacy on Academic Burnout*. https://doi.org/10.1177/07342829241252863

Woolfolk, A. (2020). *Educational psychology* (14th ed.). Pearson.

Xie, Y., Cao, D., Sun, T., & Yang, L. (2022). Academic burnout among college students: A cross-national study. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1016385

Zhao, Z., Ren, P., & Yang, Q. (2024). *Student Self-Management, Academic Achievement: Exploring the Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.11029

Zimmerman, B. J. (2016). Self-efficacy theory and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist, 21*(1–2), 3–22.

Copyright at authors some right reserved this work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License