Learning burnout of undergraduates and countermeasures analysis at Normal University

American Journal of Creative Education
Vol. 6, No. 2, 61-72, 2023
e-ISSN: 2706-6088

(Corresponding Author)

Hongyu Xie[1]
He Xiao[2]

[1]*School of Education Science, Neijiang Normal University, Neijiang, Sichuan Province, China.*
Email: 350080562@qq.com
[2]*School of Foreign Languages, Neijiang Normal University, Neijiang, Sichuan Province, China.*
Email: 1530100981@qq.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify the main causes of learning burnout in university students and propose some solutions in order to improve the quality of education. Education quality and the development of high-caliber talents are strongly impacted by learning burnout among university students which is a reflection of their learning status and learning psychology. 400 students of different majors, grades and genders from three normal universities in Southwest China participated in this study. They were given questionnaires that included demographic information, study burnout status and causes of study burnout. Finally, 395 valid questionnaires were collected. Using IBM SPSS Statistics 22.0 software for statistical analysis(T-test), the results showed that there is a phenomenon of learning burnout among university students. There are significant differences in learning burnout in terms of gender, grade and major. Meanwhile, regression analysis demonstrates that each factor influences learning burnout to a different extent. In addition, burnout and its dimensions are significantly correlated with different factors such as professional factors, self-factors, peer factors, family factors, school factors and social factors. After analysis, the countermeasures to solve learning burnout were put forward. It is necessary to organically combine these six factors to form an educational network that integrates itself, family, school, society, etc.

Keywords: *Affecting factors, Cause analysis, Countermeasures, Education quality, Gender, Grade, Learning burnout, Major, Talent power.*

DOI: 10.55284/ajce.v6i2.1002
Citation | Xie, H., & Xiao, H. (2023). Learning burnout of undergraduates and countermeasures analysis at Normal University. *American Journal of Creative Education*, *6*(2), 61–72.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.
Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.
Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
Authors' Contributions: Both authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study. Both authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.
History: Received: 9 June 2023/ Revised: 20 July 2023/ Accepted: 17 October 2023/ Published: 11 December 2023
Publisher: Online Science Publishing

Highlights of this paper

- 400 students from different majors, grades and genders from three normal universities in Southwest China participated as subjects in questionnaires including demographic information, study burnout status and causes of study burnout.
- A T-test and regression analysis were adopted to analyze the phenomenon and causes of learning burnout after collecting valid questionnaires.
- The countermeasures to learning burnout were put forward in this study.

1. INTRODUCTION

Recently, learning burnout has been a phenomenon that affects certain college students to varying degrees due to the post-COVID-19 pandemic which has raised unemployment, a lack of online learning monitoring that significantly increased the stress of competing for jobs and other causes. The main manifestations are as follows: First, students lack attendance and the phenomenon of truancy is more serious, especially in public basic courses. The phenomenon of truancy is particularly serious. Second, students have a negative attitude in class, use mobile phones during class and have a preference to sit at the back of the classroom. Third, students have lower levels of motivation for learning, they are capable of completing the assignments given to them by their professors, and they like using the internet to search out solutions to their homework.

2. RESEARCH BACKGROUND

Using "learning burnout of university students" as a key word, researchers conducted a subject search of relevant literature from 2004 to 2022 using Google and CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure) analysing and summarising the search results. The relevant research during this time can be roughly divided into three stages. The first stage was from 2004 to 2010, when scholars paid attention to college students' learning burnout and related research gradually developed from 1 paper in 2004 to 81 papers in 2009. The second stage is from 2011 to 2020, when academic burnout among university students has been widely discussed by scholars. During this stage, a total of 1187 related research articles were published, with an annual average of 118 and a peak of 139 in 2014. The third stage is from 2021 until the present. The study on college students' learning fatigue has started to indicate a decreasing trend throughout this time. When analysing the findings of the past two decades of research, it is easy to find out the definition of learning burnout, its structure and measurement, its influencing factors and its management strategies which make up the majority of the research content on this topic among college students. These study findings serve as a reference for further academic research but they also contain several flaws.

2.1. The Concept of Learning Burnout

The concept of learning burnout is developed from occupational burnout. American clinical psychologist Freuberger first put forward the relative concept of "burnout" and defined burnout as when an individual's work is not recognized by the organization or others (Freudenberger, 1974). The corresponding rewards are chronic fatigue, depression and frustration in individuals (Freudenber & Richelson, 1980). Lixian Yang defined study burnout as “the negative attitude and behavior of being bored with study due to study pressure or lack of interest in study”. China after combining the research results of foreign study burnout reflects the negative learning psychology of college students (Lixian, 2004). Li Fuye and others also believed that learning burnout is an important indicator reflecting the negative learning psychology of college students and it is the manifestation of college students' negative learning psychology such as depression, fatigue, dissatisfaction, anxiety, depression, apathy, confusion, powerlessness and low self-esteem. Learning burnout not only affects students' academic

performance but also has a certain negative impact on their interpersonal relationships and mental health (Fuye, Pei, & Jiwen, 2012). Yimeng, Yong, and Jinying (2014) believed that college students' learning burnout reflects their negative learning process and the negative psychological state and behavior with learning caused by learning pressure or a lack of learning interest. Learning burnout is the main indicator reflecting the negative learning psychological state of college students and analyzing the basic learning situation of college students can provide guidance for promoting education reform and improving the quality of college teaching (Yimeng et al., 2014).

2.2. Factors Affecting Learning Burnout

According to the scholars' analysis of the influencing factors of learning burnout, it mainly focuses on three aspects: demographic variables, internal factors and external factors.

2.2.1. Demographic Factors

The demographic variables that affect learning burnout mainly include gender, grade, major etc. It is believed that there are no significant differences between genders in college students' learning burnout (Bingcheng, 2013). The other viewpoint believes that there are substantial gender differences in the learning burnout of college students. Caichao, Xin, and Huichen (2014) conducted a questionnaire survey on college students in Tangshan and analyzed the overall score of learning burnout and the relationship between its dimensions (depressed mood, misbehavior and low sense of achievement) and gender (Caichao et al., 2014). The study found a total score for learning burnout. The gender difference in misbehavior and low sense of achievement is statistically significant while the gender difference in low mood is not statistically significant. Boys score significantly higher than girls in the total score of learning burnout, misbehavior and low sense of achievement. Jie and Zhou (2013) conducted a study on three general colleges and universities in Guiyang City using convenient sampling and found that boys scored higher than girls in all dimensions of learning burnout especially in terms of academic alienation (Jie & Zhou, 2013). There are gender differences in college students' learning burnout which may be related to sample differences, cultural differences among respondents and differences in survey methods.

There are clear grade-level disparities in the learning burnout of college students. According to Dingxiang (2012) research, students in different grades show varying levels of learning burnout with the lowest levels occurring in the second, fourth, first and third years of school (Dingxiang, 2012). Bingcheng (2013) selected one university in Yancheng, Jiangsu and Xinxiang to conduct a collective test on college students from grades one to four. He also believed that there were significant grade differences in the total score of college students' learning burnout but the overall trend of learning burnout level was with grades (Bingcheng, 2013). There is a decline in learning burnout among college students and the scores of low mood, misbehaviour and low sense of achievement in the third grade are significantly lower than those in the first and second grades. The degrees of study burnout are freshman, sophomore, junior and senior. Although the ranking of learning burnout among grades has not yet been determined with accuracy, it is known that there are disparities in the learning burnout levels of college students in various grades.

Bingcheng (2013) analyzed the differences in the learning status of college students with different types of learning burnout from the perspective of individual differences and believed that the overall score of learning burnout among liberal arts students was lower than that of science students (Bingcheng, 2013). Hongjun, Ming, and Guoqiang (2013) research results suggest that liberal arts students are not only lower than science students in the overall score of learning burnout. The scores of liberal arts students were also significantly lower than those of

science students on the three dimensions of depression, misbehavior and low sense of achievement (Hongjun et al., 2013).

2.2.2. Internal Factors

The internal factors that affect individual learning burnout include self-efficacy, coping style, personality traits, professional commitment, psychological capital and so on.

There is controversy about the relationship between academic self-efficacy and learning burnout, although Xiaoxin and Jinglei (2012) and others believe that this result may be related to the influence of academic self-efficacy on students' evaluation of their own learning ability. Students with low academic self-efficacy will imagine more failure in learning, pay attention to their own shortcomings, imagine potential difficulties as more terrifying and invest more psychological resources into possible mistakes in learning activities impairing their effective use of their own learning abilities (Xiaoxin & Jinglei, 2012). Students with high academic self-efficacy tend to imagine learning activities related to success are in a positive state of mind and can focus on problem-solving, thereby experiencing more successful experiences and reducing the level of student burnout.

According to the research, personality variables also have a certain relationship with learning burnout. Shan, Kai, and Wenyu (2012) analyzed each variable in personality and the three dimensions of learning burnout. The study found that neuroticism, openness and agreeableness among personality factors were significantly correlated with depression, extraversion, conscientiousness and depression while neuroticism, openness and misbehavior were significantly correlated with extraversion and conscientiousness (Shan et al., 2012). Dan, Hui, and Hongyan (2016) and others also believed that personality neuroticism can positively predict college students' learning burnout to a certain extent while openness and rigor can negatively predict college students' learning burnout to a certain extent (Dan et al., 2016). It can be seen that the variables in personality can predict students' learning burnout levels. Among them, the three variables of neuroticism, openness and rigor in personality are the most prominent predictors.

2.2.3. External Factors

External factors also have a greater impact on learning burnout including social support and learning pressure.

The first one is social support and learning burnout. Caichao et al. (2014) and others conducted a questionnaire survey on college students from a university and a normal college in Tangshan and analyzed the dimensions of social support and learning burnout. The findings revealed a strongly adverse relationship between overall learning burnout, depression, misbehaviour and social support (Caichao et al., 2014). Xiying, Xianxian, and Chuntao (2009) randomly selected college students from a normal university and a polytechnic in Henan to conduct a questionnaire survey and the results showed that social support was significantly correlated with learning burnout and had a significant predictive effect on learning burnout (Xiying et al., 2009). Zhihui, Zhiqi, and Zongkui (2010) used stratified cluster sampling to conduct a questionnaire survey on college students in four grades from new comers to seniors from three universities in Hubei Province (Zhihui et al., 2010). There is a significant negative correlation between social support and learning burnout and the more social support, the lower the level of learning burnout.

The next one is study pressure and study burnout. There is a significant positive relationship between college students' study pressure and study burnout, the higher the study pressure, the higher the study burnout. Songjuan Zhou and others used the questionnaire survey method to study some students at Shanxi Normal University and

the results were consistent with Ruolin (2016) results. At the same time, Songjuan Zhou (2-15) also believes that the greater the learning pressure and the more negative emotions individuals feel, they will use bad behaviors such as being late and skipping classes to avoid these bad feelings, but in their consciousness they feel that such behavior is inappropriate (Songjuan & Yaping, 2015).

3. RESEARCH PROBLEMS

The research takes undergraduate students at normal undergraduate colleges and investigates the current situation of their learning burnout, explores the reasons and puts forward corresponding intervention countermeasures in order to provide a reference for improving the quality of personnel training. The research questions are as follows:

1. What is the learning status of university students at a normal university?
2. What are the reasons causing the learning burnout of university students at a normal university?
3. How to put forward countermeasures to this phenomenon?

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. Research Participants

The study takes 400 students of different majors, grades and genders from three normal colleges and universities in Southwest China. A total of 400 questionnaires were distributed and returned of which 395 were valid and the effective rate of the questionnaires was 98.75% (see Table 1).

Table 1. The fundamental statistics of participants.

	Gender		Major		Grades			
	Male	**Female**	**Arts**	**Science**	**Freshman**	**Sophomore**	**Junior**	**Senior**
No.	146	249	189	206	101	99	95	100
Proportion (%)	37.0	63.0	47.8	52.2	25.6	25.1	24.1	25.3

4.2. Questionnaire Design

The questionnaire consists of three parts: biographical information, study burnout status investigation and study burnout cause investigation.

Basic demographical information: The basic personal information section mainly investigates the basic information of students including their gender, grade, major, academic performance etc. Study the burnout status survey: The study's burnout status survey draws on the questionnaire compiled by Lian Rong et al. It consists of three dimensions, namely depression, misbehavior and a low sense of achievement. Study burnout causes: The study's burnout cause investigation is composed of six dimensions: professional factor, self-factor, peer factor, family factor, school factor and social factor.

4.3. Research Measurement

The study used SPSS 22.0 software for statistical analysis of the returned questionnaires. The analysis shows that the internal consistency coefficient of the college students' study burnout questionnaire is 0.83. The internal consistency coefficients (alpha) for the three dimensions were 0.91, 0.87 and 0.86 respectively. The questionnaire adopts the five-point scoring method and implements reverse scoring for reverse scoring questions. The higher the questionnaire score, the higher the level of learning burnout. The internal consistency of the questionnaire on the causes of college students' learning burnout was 0.91 of which the internal consistency coefficients of

professional factors, self-factors, peer factors, family factors, school factors and social factors were 0.78, 0.84, 0.79, 0.83, 0.89 and 0.8 respectively.

5. RESULTS

5.1. Learning Status of University Students

After statistical analysis, it was found that the average learning burnout is 3.05 and the variance is 0.51. In the overall score of learning burnout, the highest score is 4.95 and the lowest score is 1.14. People with scores in the range of 3.00-4.00 are considered burnout and those with scores in the range of 4.00 are considered severe burnout. It can be found that the overall score of learning burnout in the range of 3.00-5.00 accounting for 55.95% of the total number of people. The three variables of depression, misbehavior and low sense of achievement are counted and it is found that the scores of these three variables are concentrated in 3.00-5.00 . The percentages were 65.57%, 65.32% and 54.94%, which were inappropriate. It can be seen that the problem of learning burnout is more serious at the moderate level and above. The higher level of learning burnout is depression and a low sense of achievement.

Table 2. Leaning burnout and factors variables.

	Learning burnout		Depression		Misbehavior		Low sense of achievement	
	No.	Pro. (%)	No.	Prop. (%)	No.	Prop. (%)	No.	Prop. (%)
[1.00-2.00]	13	3.29	32	8.10	26	6.58	22	5.57
[2.00-3.00]	161	40.76	105	26.58	152	38.48	114	28.86
[3.00-4.00]	199	50.38	194	49.11	191	48.35	217	54.94
[4.00-5.00]	22	5.57	64	16.20	26	6.58	42	10.63

At the same time, the above-mentioned manifestations of college students' learning burnout are analyzed in terms of gender, grade, major and other categories and the results are as follows:

5.1.1. Gender Differences in Learning Burnout

A T-test analysis of learning burnout revealed substantial gender differences in the three aspects when grouped by gender which was consistent with Roger's findings (Jie & Zhou, 2013). At the same time, the levels of depression (M=3.23, SD=0.81), misbehavior (M=2.96, SD=0.68) and study burnout (M=3.09, SD=0.53) in girls are significantly higher than those in boys. In low achievement, the level of men (M=3.07, SD=0.79) is slightly higher than that of women (M=3.03, SD=0.66) which showed that there is no significant difference between them. According to Table 3, women' learning burnout is higher than that of men.

Table 3. Gender difference in learning burnout.

Gender	Male		Female		T
	M	SD	M	SD	
Learning burnout	2.97	0.64	3.09	0.53	-2.02**
Depression	2.97	0.99	3.23	0.81	-2.68**
Misbehavior	2.85	0.76	2.96	0.68	-1.40*
Low sense of achievement	3.07	0.79	3.03	0.66	0.63

Note: *p<0.1, **p<0.05.

5.1.2 Grades and Learning Burnout

Based on Table 4, the grades were divided into four groups: freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors and variance analysis was conducted on learning burnout, depression, misbehavior and low sense of achievement. The

results showed that there is a significant grade difference in learning burnout which is consistent with Bingcheng Gao 's research conclusion (Bingcheng, 2013). Statistics showed that the levels of learning burnout (M=3.24, SD=0.65), low mood (M=3.48, SD=0.87) and misbehavior (M=3.08, SD=0.75) among freshman students are higher than those of sophomores and juniors while the levels of depression (M=3.15, SD=0.71), low achievement(M=3.09, SD=0.75) and senior are slightly higher than those of freshmen. So it can be seen that levels of learning burnout among freshmen and seniors are common occurrences in the process of learning.

Table 4. Grades and learning burnout.

Grades	Freshmen		Sophomore		Junior		Senior		F
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	
Learning burnout	3.24	0.65	2.96	0.58	2.90	0.57	3.05	0.40	7.05**
Depression	3.48	0.87	3.05	0.91	2.83	0.94	3.15	0.71	9.83**
Misbehavior	3.08	0.75	2.84	0.74	2.88	0.72	2.86	0.60	2.44**
Low sense of achievement	3.09	0.61	2.98	0.70	3.01	0.77	3.09	0.75	0.64**

Note: **p<0.05.

5.1.3. Majors and Learning Burnout

According to the majors, participants are divided into different groups and a t-test analysis on learning burnout, low mood, inappropriate behavior and low sense of achievement was conducted. The analysis in Table 5 showed that there are obvious differences in subject backgrounds for learning burnout which is consistent with Yang Hongjun's research conclusion (Hongjun et al., 2013). Science students with learning burnout level(M=3.04 SD=0.56) and depression (M=2.98 SD=0.96) were significantly higher than liberal arts students. There was no significant difference between the two in misconduct and low sense of achievement.

Table 5. Majors and learning burnout.

Majors	Arts		Science		T
	M	SD	M	SD	
Learning burnout	2.92	0.50	3.04	0.56	-2.13**
Depression	2.75	0.79	2.98	0.96	-2.60**
Misbehavior	3.06	0.66	3.10	0.75	-0.58
Low sense of achievement	2.93	0.65	2.98	0.76	-0.80

Note: **p<0.05.

5.2. Outcome of Learning Burnout

In Table 6, the average score of the professional factor is 2.23. The analysis of the topic of the professional factor showed that the students believe that the major they study is far from their own assumptions and they have no sense of identity or achievement in their major. Analysis of professional factors, learning burnout and various dimensions showed that there was a significant positive relationship between professional factors and learning burnout (0.57), depression (0.64) and misbehavior (0.52).

Table 6. The relationship between learning burnout and professional factor.

	M	SD	Major factor	Learning burnout	Depression	Misbehavior	Low sense of achievement
Major factor	2.23	0.62	1.00				
Learning burnout	2.98	0.53	0.57***	1			
Depression	2.87	0.89	0.64***	0.84***	1		
Misbehavior	3.08	0.71	0.52***	0.81***	0.56***	1	
Low sense of achievement	2.96	0.71	-0.03	0.49***	0.03	0.28***	1

Note: ***p<0.01.

The self-factor in Table 7 has an average score of 2.25. Some students believe that their own self-nature and level of attention are weak which prevents them from carrying out their learning goals. When self-factors, learning burnout and other dimensions are analysed, the findings reveal a substantial positive relationship between self-factors and misbehaviour (0.52), depression (0.59) and learning burnout (0.58).

Table 7. The relationship between learning burnout and own factor.

	M	SD	Own factor	Learning burnout	Depression	Misbehavior	Low sense of achievement
Own factor	2.25	0.72	1.00				
Learning burnout	2.98	0.53	0.58***	1			
Depression	2.87	0.89	0.59***	0.84***	1		
Misbehavior	3.08	0.71	0.52***	0.81***	0.56***	1	
Low sense of achievement	2.96	0.71	0.08	0.49***	0.03	0.28***	1

Note: ***p<0.01.

In Table 8, the peer factor had an average score of 2.05. By analyzing the related topics of peer factors, it can be found that the learning attitude of peers will affect their own learning attitude and they lack the emotional encouragement and support of peers in learning. The peer factors, learning burnout and various dimensions were analyzed and the results showed that peer factors were significantly positively correlated with learning burnout (0.36), low mood (0.47) misbehavior (0.28) and a low sense of achievement (-0.14). Sex is negatively correlated.

Table 8. The relationship between learning burnout and peer factor.

	M	SD	Peer factor	Learning burnout	Depression	Misbehavior	Low sense of achievement
Peer factor	2.05	0.71	1.00				
Learning burnout	2.98	0.53	0.36***	1			
Depression	2.87	0.89	0.47***	0.84***	1		
Misbehavior	3.08	0.71	0.28***	0.81***	0.56***	1	
Low sense of achievement	2.96	0.71	-0.14***	0.49***	0.03	0.28***	1

Note: ***p<0.01.

In Table 9, the average score for the family factor was 2.00. A statistical analysis of the topics related to family factors shows whether family members can help students' learning and their attitudes towards learning to a large extent. According to the analysis of family factors, study burnout and various dimensions, the results show that family factors are significantly and positively correlated with study burnout (0.24), depression (0.41), misbehavior (0.16) and a low sense of achievement (-0.22) which have a significant negative correlation among them.

Table 9. The relationship between learning burnout and family factor.

	M	SD	Family factor	Learning burnout	Depression	Misbehavior	Low sense of achievement
Family factor	2.0	0.91	1.00				
Learning burnout	2.98	0.53	0.24***	1			
Depression	2.87	0.89	0.41***	0.84***	1		
Misbehavior	3.08	0.71	0.16***	0.81***	0.56***	1	
Low sense of achievement	2.96	0.71	-0.22***	0.49***	0.03	0.28***	1

Note: ***p<0.01.

In Table 10, the school factor had an average score of 1.80. A statistical analysis of school-related topics shows that teachers' boring lectures and the lack of resources provided by schools are the main factors that affect students' learning burnout. According to the analysis of school factors, learning burnout and various dimensions, the results show that school factors are significantly positively correlated with learning burnout (0.26), low mood (0.40), misbehavior (0.17) and a low sense of achievement (-0.13). Sex is negatively correlated.

Table 10. The relationship between learning burnout and school factor.

	M	SD	School factor	Learning burnout	Depression	Misbehavior	Low sense of achievement
School factor	1.80	0.78	1.00				
Learning burnout	2.98	0.53	0.26***	1			
Depression	2.87	0.89	0.40***	0.84***	1		
Misbehavior	3.08	0.71	0.17***	0.81***	0.56***	1	
Low sense of achievement	2.96	0.71	-0.13***	0.49***	0.03	0.28***	1

Note: ***p<0.01.

In Table 11, the average score for social factors was 1.98. A statistical analysis of topics related to social factors shows that external temptation and employment pressure are the main factors affecting students' learning burnout. There is a significant positive relationship between social factors and learning burnout (0.43), depression (0.53) and misbehavior (0.31).

Table 11. The relationship between learning burnout and social factor.

	M	SD	Social factor	Learning burnout	Depression	Misbehavior	Low sense of achievement
Social factor	1.98	0.74	1.00				
Learning burnout	2.98	0.53	0.43***	1			
Depression	2.87	0.89	0.53***	0.84***	1		
Misbehavior	3.08	0.71	0.31***	0.81***	0.56***	1	
Low sense of achievement	2.96	0.71	-0.05	0.49***	0.03	0.28***	1

Note: ***p<0.01.

6. DISCUSSION

By analyzing the causes of learning burnout, it is found that the relationship between the six dimensions and learning burnout is: self-factor (0.58) > professional factor (0.57) > social factor (0.43) > peer factor (0.36) > school factor (0.26) > family factor (0.24). Personal and professional factors are the main factors that cause learning burnout. They believe that low recognition of the profession, a lack of learning initiative, a lack of good study habits and low self-control lead to their study burnout. The survey results show that in addition to self and professional factors, social factors and school factors are also the main factors that lead to learning burnout. Among social factors, social orientation affects college students' attitudes towards learning. Among the school-related causes, boring teachers in the classroom, a lack of study rooms and hours, community activities taking up study time and resources in the study rooms and poor administration all contribute to student burnout.

Professional factors, self-factors, peer factors, school factors, family factors and social factors all affect students' learning burnout levels to varying degrees. To improve college students' learning burnout, we can start by improving students' recognition of their own majors, their learning motivation and their self-control. College students usually attribute their own personal and professional factors to their study burnout and believe that their

families and schools have little to do with it because their psychology is still developing and their self-control is insufficient. School education and social education collaborate and work together to more effectively address the issue of learning burnout.

7. COUNTERMEASURES OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' LEARNING BURNOUT

To solve the problem of college students' learning burnout, it is necessary not only to fully mobilize students' own consciousness and initiative but also to take students as the center and to build an education mechanism for all-round cooperation between schools, students, families and society. The following aspects should be followed:

7.1. Motivation of Students

The main source of learning for university students is motivation. We must encourage students in order to increase their motivation for learning and address the issue of learning burnout. We must encourage students to make full use of their subjective initiative and to learn on their own.

College students are the main force behind social reform, innovation and development, shouldering a sacred mission. They need to clarify their own learning motivations and make career plans based on their understanding of the value of knowledge, their own abilities and their direct interest in learning.

Secondly, make and complete a study plan. Colleges and universities have carried out online teaching in order to strengthen epidemic prevention and control under the guidance of the "Guiding Opinions" of the Ministry of Education. During this period, colleges and universities have also vigorously explored online and offline hybrid teaching. The development of online teaching has put forward higher requirements for the autonomy and self-discipline of students' learning. Students are required to learn self-regulation. When making a study plan, they must consider the feasibility of the plan and whether it can be completed in quality and quantity. The study plan must be followed to guarantee. When tasks are completed on time, learners can reflect on their own learning and ask others to check on their progress.

A study method must be selected efficiently and quickly to complete learning tasks, firmly grasp what has been learned, make learning easier and effectively reduce students' boredom with learning.

7.2. School Education

School education is responsible for the future of students. The quality of school teaching not only affects the enthusiasm of students to learn but also affects the improvement of the quality of undergraduate talent training. Colleges and universities should effectively improve the ability of talent training, improve the quality of undergraduate teaching and improve students' learning burnout levels. We can start with the following aspects:

First, guide community activities and standardize classroom discipline. Club activities are an essential part of students' practice. However, too many club activities occupy part of the learning resources, such as occupying the study room and taking up students' study time. Therefore, schools should reasonably guide students to participate in club activities. At the same time, college students have the ability to manage themselves but their determination to refuse temptation is not strong especially during the class period when there are many "head-downers" which requires teachers to standardize classroom management (Baosheng, 2019) and help students resist temptation.

Secondly, improve teaching methods and improve the quality of undergraduate teaching. In traditional classroom teaching, teachers mainly teach but recently the teaching content has been updated slowly. With the advancement of technology such as cloud computing, artificial intelligence, big data and 5G, learning methods

have become more flexible and diverse which requires teachers to master the use of multimedia and other modern information technologies in education and teaching. Various teaching modes such as online and offline teaching create a "smart classroom that adapts to the needs of students' self-learning, self-management, and self-service" and timely integrate various teaching methods such as MOOCs, micro-courses, flipped classrooms and hybrid classrooms centered on discovery and exploration. Models are introduced into classrooms. " Students get busy and teach live" (Baosheng, 2019), increasing students' participation in learning and improving students' autonomy and initiative in learning. Teachers should improve students' autonomous learning abilities.

Thirdly, optimize the curriculum structure and construct the curriculum system scientifically. The school's knowledge-based curriculum structure limits the development of students' subjectivity to a certain extent, affects students' interest in learning, ignores the cultivation of students'personalities and makes it difficult to cultivate outstanding and top-notch innovative talents. Colleges and universities should take the construction of the "Double Ten Thousand Plan" of first-class courses as an opportunity to follow the standard of "one degree of gender", eliminate "water courses" and make every effort to create "golden courses" (Baosheng, 2019). In the adjustment of the new curriculum structure, it is necessary to reflect students' free and independent learning and interactive exploration, cultivate students' habits of questioning and thinking, guide students to construct knowledge systems independently and fully stimulate curiosity and creativity. Let "the curriculum be real and the disciplines be special" (Baosheng, 2019). "Further optimize the curriculum system, reduce the total number of credits, simplify the number of courses, reasonably increase the difficulty of courses and academic challenges and implement the requirements of improving the quality of personnel training throughout the entire process of teaching management" (Baosheng, 2019).

Fourth, strengthen career planning and employment guidance. Uncertain student goals will lead to learning burnout. Therefore, schools should closely follow the three keys of "students learn well, teachers teach well and schools manage well" (Baosheng, 2019), strengthen career planning and employment guidance, guide students to establish clear learning goals and increase interest and motivation in learning.

7.3. Family Education

Family plays a subtle and silent role in the growth of students. Family members can guide students in learning in the following aspects:

First, enhance awareness of educational responsibility and give full play to the supervisory role. Sending students to the university does not mean that the educational task has been completed. Parents should make full use of letters, telephones, the internet and other methods to actively contact students and teachers to grasp the psychological dynamics of students and give timely guidance.

Second, create a good family atmosphere and provide help. Many parents think that they can't help students' learning due to cultural and geographical restrictions. Students' study habits, learning concepts and attitudes will be affected by the family. Therefore, families need to create a good atmosphere and provide timely help to motivate students to learn.

Third, build a reasonable expectation. Parents' expectations affect students' attitudes towards learning. When parents make demands from students, they must be realistic and put forward reasonable expectations according to the students' own conditions and characteristics. This will affect students' trust in their parents.

Fourth, use effective frustration management. In contemporary society, some parents take care of their children too carefully and spoil them too much. They lack self-control and psychological endurance. They are easy to give up when facing difficulties. They lack the experience and ability to face setbacks and blows and they are

prone to extremes. Therefore, parents should not only care about their children's scientific knowledge education but also care about their children's mental health, physical fitness and other aspects of frustration education.

REFERENCES

Baosheng, C. (2019). *Speech at the "Six excellence and one top-notch*. Paper presented at the Program 2.0 Launch Conference 04-29.

Bingcheng, G. (2013). Types of college students' learning burnout and its impact on learning. *China Special Education, 12*, 84-89.

Caichao, L., Xin, C., & Huichen, L. (2014). The characteristics of college students' learning burnout and its relationship with social support and self-worth. *Chinese Journal of Health Psychology, 22*(11), 1730-1732.

Dan, S., Hui, L., & Hongyan, Q. (2016). Correlation between study burnout and big five personality among college students in Hengyang area. *Chinese Journal of Health Psychology, 24*(9), 1381-1384.

Dingxiang, Z. (2012). *Compilation and application of the questionnaire on the causes of study burnout of college students*. Shanxi: Shanxi Medical University.

Freudenber, H. J., & Richelson, G. (1980). *Burnout: The high costof & high achievement*. New York: Doubleday.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues, 30*(1), 159-165.

Fuye, L., Pei, Z. H., & Jiwen, L. (2012). Study burnout and influencing factors of Xinjiang college students. *Chinese Journal of Public Health, 28*(8), 1104-1105.

Hongjun, Y., Ming, G., & Guoqiang, L. (2013). The relationship between college students' learning burnout and adult attachment: the role of self-model. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 21*(5), 829-831.

Jie, L., & Zhou, Y. (2013). The moderating role of gender in the relationship between learning adaptation and learning burnout of college students. *China Special Education, 12*(6), 69-73.

Lixian, Y. (2004). *Research on the current state of college students' learning burnout and its relationship with professional commitment*. Fuzhou: Fujian Normal University.

Ruolin, Z. (2016). *The relationship between study stress and study burnout of college students: The moderating effect of sense of control*. Changsha: Hunan Normal University.

Shan, J., Kai, Z., & Wenyu, Z. (2012). Research on the relationship between the current situation of learning burnout and personality characteristics of college students. *Chinese Journal of Health Psychology, 20*(9), 1411-1413.

Songjuan, Z., & Yaping, Q. (2015). Research on the relationship between college students' psychological capital, learning pressure, and learning burnout and its educational enlightenment. *Western Quality Education, 1*(3), 28-29.

Xiaoxin, W., & Jinglei, M. (2012). A study on the relationship between academic self-efficacy, self-esteem and learning burnout of college students. *Journal of Northeast Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*(1), 192-196.

Xiying, L., Xianxian, S., & Chuntao, G. (2009). Research on the relationship between social support, control points, learning pressure and learning burnout of college students. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 17*(3), 287-289.

Yimeng, M., Yong, M., & Jinying, X. (2014). The relationship between time management tendency and learning burnout of college students: the mediating role of self-efficacy. *Modern Preventive Medicine, 41*(17), 3161-3164.

Zhihui, P., Zhiqi, Y., & Zongkui, Z. (2010). The relationship between social support and learning burnout of college students: the mediating role of coping style. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology, 18*(5), 654-656.