



Examining The Reasons of Students' School Absenteeism: The Case of Bakırköy District

Öğrencilerin Okula Devamsızlık Nedenlerinin İncelenmesi: Bakırköy İlçesi Örneği

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research is to determine the reasons for absenteeism of students according to different variables (gender, school level, number of days of absenteeism without excuse). The sample of the research consists of 875 students who continue their education in Istanbul Bakırköy district. The Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire was used within the scope of the research. The results of the analysis in the research revealed that the sub-dimensions of school and administration, teacher, environment, academic anxiety, personal reasons and friend circle differ according to gender. In addition, there were differences in the reasons for absenteeism of the students according to the school level and the number of days of absenteeism without excuse. In some of the correlation analyzes carried out considering the answers given by the students to the questionnaire items, moderate positive or negative relationships were found.

Keywords: Absenteeism, Reasons for Absenteeism, School Absenteeism, Student

ÖZET

Bu araştırmanın amacı, öğrencilerin devamsızlık nedenlerinin farklı değişkenlere (cinsiyet, okul kademesi, özürsüz devamsızlık yapılan gün sayısı) göre belirlenmesidir. Araştırmanın örneklemini İstanbul Bakırköy ilçesi genelinde eğitimine devam eden 875 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırma kapsamında Devamsızlık Nedenleri Anketi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmadaki analiz sonuçları, okul ve yönetim, öğretmen, çevre, akademik kaygı, kişisel ve arkadaş çevresi nedenler alt boyutlarının cinsiyete göre farklılaştığını ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca okul kademesi ve özürsüz devamsızlık yapılan gün sayısına göre öğrencilerin devamsızlık nedenlerinde farklılıklar görülmüştür. Öğrencilerin anket maddelerine verdiği yanıtlar dikkate alınarak gerçekleştirilen korelasyon analizlerinin bazılarında da orta düzeyde pozitif ya da negatif ilişkiler bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Devamsızlık, Devamsızlık Nedenleri, Okula Devamsızlık, Öğrenci

INTRODUCTION

Absenteeism, or truancy, as it is commonly expressed, has received academic attention for a long time (Kearney, 2003; Ünver, 2022). Absenteeism and its repercussions are important for educational research as they can significantly limit an individual's life opportunities. Irregular attendance has been associated with negative peer and school relationships (Corville-Smith et al., 1998), inadequate academic achievement (Roby, 2004), and drop-out from school (DeSocio et al., 2007).

There may be more than one variable that restricts a student's regular attendance at school. Flaherty et al. (2012) state that the phenomenon of truancy is important in examining various risk factors and characteristics of truant students, and that this phenomenon should be considered together with many different complex problems. In addition, in studies on absenteeism, whether absenteeism is caused by risky behaviors; It is seen that there are also discussions about whether risky behaviors lead to absenteeism (Gage et al., 2013).

The concept of school dropout, which is another issue related to absenteeism, is defined by Dekkers and Claassen (2001) as the inability of a student who actively continues education and training activities to continue and complete the education level they are in due to negative reasons due to different reasons. The concept of early leaving is also seen as a problem in which the effects on the future life of the individual and the causes that cause problems are investigated (Estevao and Alvares, 2014).

Hasan Kara ¹ 
Sami Öz ² 
Hasan Fehmi Ergan ³ 
Cemil Tula ⁴ 

How to Cite This Article

Kara, H., Öz, S., Ergan, H.F. & Tula, C. (2023). "Examining The Reasons of Students' School Absenteeism: The Case of Bakırköy District" International Social Sciences Studies Journal, (e-ISSN:2587-1587) Vol:9, Issue:108; pp:5205-5215. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.29228/sssj.67182>

Arrival: 19 November 2022
Published: 28 February 2023

Social Sciences Studies Journal is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

¹ Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Istanbul Bakırköy Guidance and Research Center, ORCID: 0000-0001-7481-2210

² Teacher, Ministry of National Education, Istanbul Gungoren Yahya Sergeant Primary School, ORCID: 0000-0002-6182-3217

³ Teacher, Ministry of National Education, İstanbul Güngören 75. Yıl Secondary School, ORCID: 0000-0002-7642-4673

⁴ Teacher, Ministry of National Education, İstanbul Güngören Cumhuriyet Primary School, ORCID: 0000-0002-3345-3351

There is no legally defined concept of early leaving in the Turkish Education System (Ünver, 2022). Compulsory education period has been arranged as 12 years starting from the 2012-2013 academic year, covering primary, secondary and high school levels. This 12-year period was accepted as the compulsory education period and the legal definition of "absenteeism" was used for the student's absence from school during this period. According to the regulations of the Ministry of National Education on pre-school and primary education institutions and regulations on secondary education institutions, it is compulsory for students to attend primary school, secondary school and high school in terms of age/population age.

Students who do not attend school and are absent from school in our country are registered daily in the e-school system of the Ministry of National Education. These data are seen by the education stakeholders authorized by the ministry. Students' absences from school are reported to their parents by mail, e-mail or other informatics tools. Although the periods of absenteeism are different from each other in primary, secondary and high school schools, students who exceed 30 days in total, including 10 days without an excuse and 20 days with a disability, are considered unsuccessful for the education period. Students who are deemed unsuccessful due to absenteeism are considered to be legally repetitive in the next academic year. Students who repeat a grade twice during the education period are expelled from formal education and are dismissed from the school. Students who are excluded from formal education are directed to education activities in open education schools coordinated by Public Education Centers within the open education system. It results in the student leaving the education system without receiving any diploma (only secondary education diploma is given by the Ministry of National Education in our country) due to long-term absences that are not included in the open education system (Karapür, 2017).

In our country, studies on absenteeism and drop-out were mostly carried out in the early 2000s, and they gained intensity at the level of primary school types. In this context, the "Achieving Gender Equality in Education and Social Participation" project, carried out by the Mother-Child Education Foundation (AÇEV), Education Reform Initiative (ERG) and the Association for Supporting and Training Women Candidates (KA-DER), addressed the barriers to education from different dimensions (Ünver, 2022). In these projects, it has been reported that schooling rates in our country have increased, but due to various reasons, students at school type levels do not continue their education activities and cannot complete their education. However, the fact that the definition of the concept of early leaving is not included in the current legal regulations in our country does not make it possible to reach the source of reliable data on the problem and causes this situation to be evaluated as a very important deficiency (Göçen and Kaya, 2019).

Although problematic absenteeism is examined and evaluated under different definitions such as drop-out in the literature, the situation where a student cannot continue or complete the compulsory education and training process due to various reasons and is not included in any education and training form is on a global scale. It is an issue that needs to be studied meticulously in all countries of the world (Karapür, 2017). With this study, it is aimed to examine the students' absenteeism from school, and in the light of the results obtained, it is thought that the measures that can be taken at school-family-student levels may be more effective.

METHOD

Model of the Research

This research was carried out according to the cross-section approach from scanning models.

Population and Sample of the Research

The universe of this research consists of students residing in Istanbul Bakırköy district and continuing their education. The sample consists of 875 students determined by convenience sampling method.

Data Collection Tools

In the study, the Personal Information Form, which was created by the researchers, determining the gender, age, school level and number of days of absence without excuse; The Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire was used for absenteeism.

The Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire is a 51-item questionnaire created by the Ministry of National Education (2022), which can be applied individually or in groups to reveal the reasons for students' absenteeism. The related questionnaire can be applied by the classroom guidance teachers within the school guidance program. Reasons for absenteeism are school and administration dimension (items 1-10), teacher dimension (items 11-17), family dimension (items 18-26), environmental dimension (items 27-31), academic anxiety dimension (items 32-31). 36 items), personal reasons (items 37-45) and friend circle (items 46-51). The internal consistency coefficient of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire in this study was observed to be .93.

Analysis of Data

After obtaining the necessary official permissions for the collection of research data, the forms and measurement tool were published in school groups between 11.05.2022 and 13.06.2022 by researchers, guidance and psychological counselors and teachers. SPSS 26.0 statistical package program was used in the analysis of the data.

Ethical Permissions of Research

In this study, all the rules specified to be followed within the scope of “Higher Education Institutions Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Directive” were complied with. None of the actions specified under the title of “Actions Contrary to Scientific Research and Publication Ethics”, which is the second part of the directive, were not carried out. Ethics committee approval of the research was also obtained from the ethics committee unit in Bakırköy District Governorship District Directorate of National Education.

RESULTS

General Descriptive Statistics of Students

During the data collection period, 875 students were reached. The data on the socio-demographic information of the students participating in the research are given in Table 1.

Table 1: General descriptive statistics of students

N = 875			n (%)
Gender	Girl		540 (%62)
	Boy		335 (%38)
School Level	Primary School		137 (%15,7)
	Secondary School		67 (%7,7)
	High School		671 (%76,7)
Number of Days of Absence without Excuse	0 Day		60 (%6,9)
	1-4 Days		332 (%37,9)
	5-9 Days		228 (%26,1)
	10-19 Days		214 (%24,5)
	20+ Days		41 (%4,7)

t-test Analysis of Variables

The results of the independent groups t-test applied to analyze whether the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire and its sub-dimensions (school and administration, teacher, family, environment, academic anxiety, personal reasons, friend circle) differ according to the gender of the students are presented in Table 2. As can be seen in Table 2, a gender difference is observed in other sub-dimensions of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire, except for the family sub-dimension. According to these results, boy students have school and administration ($\bar{X}=2.63$, $SD=0.3$), teacher ($\bar{X}=2.79$, $SD=0.4$), environment ($\bar{X}=2.69$, $SD=0.3$), academic anxiety ($\bar{X}=2.68$, $SD=0.4$) and personal reasons ($\bar{X}=2.47$, $SD=0.3$) are more absent than girl students.

Table 2: T-test results comparing the mean and standard deviation values of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire by gender

	Gender		t	p
	Girl (n=540)	Boy (n=335)		
N=875	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)		
School and Administration Sub-Dimension	2.56 (0.4)	2.63 (0.3)	-2.730	.006
Teacher Sub-Dimension	2.68 (0.5)	2.79 (0.4)	-2.636	.009
Family Sub-Dimension	2.78 (0.2)	2.80 (0.2)	-1.429	.153
Environment Sub-Dimension	2.61 (0.4)	2.69 (0.3)	-2.629	.009
Academic Anxiety Sub-Dimension	2.60 (0.4)	2.68 (0.4)	-2.521	.012
Personal Reasons Sub-Dimension	2.39 (0.4)	2.47 (0.3)	-2.828	.005
Friend Circle Sub-Dimension	2.86 (0.2)	2.88 (0.2)	-1.008	.314

ANOVA Analysis of Variables

Table 3 shows the results of the ANOVA test applied to analyze whether the sub-dimensions of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire differ according to the school level of the students.

Table 3: ANOVA results comparing the mean and standard deviation values of the Reasons of Absenteeism Questionnaire by school level

	Okul Kademesi			F	p
	Primary School (n=137) (n=671)	Secondary School (n=67)	High School		
N=875	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)	\bar{X} (SD)		
School and Administration Sub-Dimension	2.93 (0.1)	2.85 (0.2)	2.49 (0.4)	101.936	.000
Teacher Sub-Dimension	2.94 (0.2)	2.88 (0.3)	2.66 (0.6)	17.748	.000
Family Sub-Dimension	2.91 (0.1)	2.87 (0.1)	2.75 (0.2)	23.769	.000
Environment Sub-Dimension	2.89 (0.1)	2.88 (0.1)	2.56 (0.4)	53.314	.000
Academic Anxiety Sub-Dimension	2.96 (0.1)	2.82 (0.3)	2.55 (0.4)	68.570	.000
Personal Reasons Sub-Dimension	2.70 (0.1)	2.61 (0.3)	2.34 (0.4)	55.812	.000
Friend Circle Sub-Dimension	2.95 (0.1)	2.90 (0.2)	2.85 (0.2)	10.135	.000

According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, it was observed that there was a significant difference between all the sub-dimensions of the Reasons of Absenteeism Questionnaire and the school levels of the students. In the post-hoc analysis (Games-Howell) conducted to test which group differs significantly from the other, students in high school level are more absent than students in primary and secondary school due to school and administration, teachers, family, environment, academic anxiety, personal reasons and friend circle.

Table 4 shows the results of the ANOVA test applied to analyze whether the sub-dimensions of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire differ according to the number of days that students are absent without an excuse.

Table 4: ANOVA results comparing the mean and standard deviation values of the Causes of Absenteeism Questionnaire according to the number of days without excuse

	School Level					F	p
	0Day(n=60)	1-4Days(n=332)	5-9Days(n=228)	10-19Days(n=214)	20+Days(n=41)		
N=875	\bar{X} (SD)						
School and Administration Sub-Dimension	2.83 (0.3)	2.60 (0.3)	2.47 (0.4)	2.63 (0.4)	2.57 (0.4)	11.350	.000
Teacher Sub-Dimension	2.95 (0.2)	2.74 (0.5)	2.61 (0.6)	2.77 (0.5)	2.68 (0.6)	5.074	.000
Family Sub-Dimension	2.90 (0.1)	2.80 (0.2)	2.75 (0.2)	2.80 (0.2)	2.64 (0.4)	7.392	.000
Environment Sub-Dimension	2.87 (0.2)	2.70 (0.3)	2.51 (0.4)	2.65 (0.4)	2.45 (0.5)	15.356	.000
Academic Anxiety Sub-Dimension	2.90 (0.2)	2.64 (0.4)	2.52 (0.4)	2.66 (0.4)	2.64 (0.4)	10.276	.000
Personal Reasons Sub-Dimension	2.69 (0.2)	2.46 (0.3)	2.30 (0.4)	2.44 (0.4)	2.29 (0.4)	13.656	.000
Friend Circle Sub-Dimension	2.96 (0.1)	2.87 (0.2)	2.86 (0.2)	2.86 (0.2)	2.76 (0.4)	3.266	.011

According to the results of the ANOVA analysis, it was observed that there was a significant difference between all the sub-dimensions of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire and the number of days the students were absent without an excuse. In the post-hoc analysis (Games-Howell) conducted to test which group differed significantly from the other, students who were absent for 0 days were more likely to be absent for 1-4 days, 5-9 days, 10-19 days, 20+ days without an excuse. It is seen that the school and its administration, teachers, their families, their environment, academic concerns, personal reasons and friends are taken into account.

Correlation Analysis of Variables

The results of the correlation analysis applied to determine whether the sub-dimensions of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire and the socio-demographic characteristics of the students are related are given in Table 5. As can be seen in Table 5, there are variables that show significant correlation at $r = .30$ or $r > .30$ levels.

There is a moderate negative correlation between school level and the number of days of absenteeism without excuse ($r = -.385$). According to this relationship, as the school level increases (high school), the number of non-excused absence days increases.

There is a moderate negative correlation between school level and school and management sub-dimension ($r = -.426$). According to this relationship, as the school level increases (high school), the school rules and the attitudes of the administrators cause absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the teacher sub-dimension and the school and administration sub-dimension ($r = .550$). According to this relationship, school rules and attitudes of administrators and negative attitudes of teachers cause students to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the family sub-dimension and the school and management sub-dimension ($r = .420$). According to this relationship, students with negative socio-cultural and family structure have difficulty in complying with school rules and negative attitudes of school administrators cause them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the family sub-dimension and the teacher sub-dimension ($r = .312$). According to this relationship, students with negative socio-cultural and family structure are more likely to encounter negative attitudes of teachers and these situations cause them to be absent.

There is a moderate negative relationship between the sub-dimension of environment and school level ($r = -.316$). According to this relationship, as the school level increases (high school), the environment of the students causes them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the environment sub-dimension and the school and management sub-dimension ($r = .620$). According to this relationship, students with negative physical and social environment are absent when they encounter school rules and attitudes of administrators.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the environment sub-dimension and the teacher sub-dimension ($r = .372$). According to this relationship, negative attitudes of teachers to students with negative socio-cultural and family structure cause them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the environment sub-dimension and the family sub-dimension ($r = .413$). According to this relationship, students with negative socio-cultural and family structure have negative environmental conditions and this situation causes them to be absent.

There is a moderate negative correlation between academic anxiety sub-dimension and school level ($r = -.366$). According to this relationship, as the school level increases (high school), students' academic anxiety levels increase and this situation causes them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the academic anxiety sub-dimension and the school and management sub-dimension ($r = .667$). According to this relationship, the school rules and the attitudes of the administrators increase the academic anxiety levels of the students and cause them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the academic anxiety sub-dimension and the teacher sub-dimension ($r = .497$). According to this relationship, teachers' negative attitudes increase students' academic anxiety and cause them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the academic anxiety sub-dimension and the family sub-dimension ($r = .415$). According to this relationship, negative socio-cultural and family structure increases students' academic anxiety levels and causes them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the academic anxiety sub-dimension and the environment sub-dimension ($r = .571$). According to this relationship, negative physical and social environmental conditions increase students' academic anxiety levels and cause them to be absent.

There is a moderate negative correlation between the personal reasons sub-dimension and the school level ($r = -.332$). According to this relationship, as the school level increases (high school), students exhibit more negative personal characteristics and this situation causes them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the personal reasons sub-dimension and the school and management sub-dimension ($r = .683$). According to this relationship, the school rules and the attitudes of the administrators make it difficult for the students to comply with the rules and this situation increases the absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the personal reasons sub-dimension and the teacher sub-dimension ($r = .431$). According to this relationship, teachers' negative attitudes cause students to show more negative personal characteristics and to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the personal reasons sub-dimension and the family sub-dimension ($r = .468$). According to this relationship, students with negative socio-cultural and family structure exhibit more negative personal characteristics and this situation causes them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the personal reasons sub-dimension and the environment sub-dimension ($r = .614$). According to this relationship, negative environmental conditions and negative personal characteristics of students cause absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the personal reasons sub-dimension and the academic anxiety sub-dimension ($r = .690$). According to this relationship, students with negative personal characteristics have high academic anxiety levels and this causes them to be absent.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the friend circle sub-dimension and the school and management sub-dimension ($r = .509$). According to this relationship, the school rules and the attitudes of the administrators and the negative attitudes of the students' friends at school or outside the school cause absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the friend circle sub-dimension and the teacher sub-dimension ($r = .411$). According to this relationship, the negative attitudes of the teachers and the negative attitudes of the students' friends at school or outside the school cause absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the circle of friends and the family sub-dimension ($r = .345$). According to this relationship, the negative attitudes of students with negative socio-cultural and family structure and their friends at school or outside of school cause absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the friend circle sub-dimension and the environment sub-dimension ($r = .350$). According to this relationship, the negative attitudes of students with a negative physical and social environment and their friends at school or outside of school cause absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the friend circle sub-dimension and the environment sub-dimension ($r = .449$). According to this relationship, the negative attitudes of students' friends at school or outside of school cause an increase in academic anxiety levels and absenteeism.

There is a moderately positive relationship between the friend circle sub-dimension and the environment sub-dimension ($r = .482$). According to this relationship, students' negative personal characteristics and negative environmental conditions cause them to be absent.

Table 5: Mean, standard deviation and correlation values of the variables

	Mean (\bar{X})	Standard Deviation (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. School Level	2.61	0.7	1									
2. Gender	1.38	0.4	-.160**	1								
3. Number of Days of Absenteeism without Excuse	2.16	1.1	-.385**	.107**	1							
4. School and Administration Sub-Dimension	2.59	0.4	-.426**	.092**	.115**	1						
5. Teacher Sub-Dimension	2.72	0.5	-.195**	.089**	.071*	.550**	1					
6. Family Sub-Dimension	2.79	0.2	-.225**	.048	.028	.420**	.312**	1				
7. Enviroment Sub-Dimension	2.64	0.4	-.316**	.089**	.016	.620**	.372**	.413**	1			
8. Academic Anxiety Sub-Dimension	2.63	0.4	-.366**	.085*	.115**	.667**	.497**	.415**	.571**	1		
9. Personal Reasons Sub-Dimension	2.42	0.4	-.332**	.095**	.067*	.683**	.431**	.468**	.614**	.690**	1	
10. Friend Circle Sub-Dimension	2.87	0.2	-.151**	.034	.017	.509**	.411**	.345**	.350**	.449**	.482**	1

DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research is to determine the reasons for students' absenteeism according to different variables. The sample of the research consists of 875 students who continue their education in Istanbul Bakırköy district.

The results of the analyzes carried out to determine whether there is a difference between the genders show that there is a significant difference in the reasons for absenteeism of boy and girl students. Boy students are more absent than girl students regarding the dimensions of school and administration, teacher, environment, academic anxiety and personal reasons. Different studies show that gender is linked to not attending school. Especially due to economic inadequacies, boys participate in the labor force, while girls may be faced with helping with housework and being forced into early marriage (Rao, 2016). In addition, in rural areas, the low income of households and the presence of food insecurity may cause children to be employed as workers in agriculture or used as housekeepers (Mooch and Leslie, 1986; Singh and Mukherjee, 2018). This situation is an important factor in the absence of children from school. Ramachandran (2009) states that the problems in agricultural production cause the education of girls to be prevented. In this context, many girls have to work as wage workers and also support their mothers in housework. It is also expected that the boys will be directed to the professional activities that the household is usually engaged in and take on the responsibilities of the household (Agrawal, 2014). In his research, Özer (1991) found that the reason for the higher risk of absenteeism among boys is that boys work in jobs that generate income for the family economy. Zorbaz (2018), on the other hand, stated that because of the low family economy, boys could not attend school and had to drop out in order to earn money and contribute economically to the family economy at this point; on the other hand, girls are unable to attend school and have to leave school in order to support their mother who works for housework or, in case of having a sibling care.

In the analyzes carried out, it was observed that there was a significant difference between all the sub-dimensions of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire and the school levels of the students. It was observed that the students at the high school level were more absent than the students at the primary and secondary school levels within the scope of the dimensions of school and administration, teacher, family, environment, academic anxiety, personal reasons and friend circle. It was also observed that there was a significant difference between all the sub-dimensions of the Reasons for Absenteeism Questionnaire and the number of days the students were absent without an excuse. In the analyzes, students who are absent for 0 days take into account are more likely to report their school and administration, teachers, family, environment, academic concerns, personal reasons and friends than students who are absent for 1-4 days, 5-9 days, 10-19 days, 20+ days without excuse.

The correlation analyzes conducted show that as the school level increases (high school), the number of non-excused absentee days increases; as the school level increases (high school), school rules and the attitudes of the administrators cause absenteeism; school rules and attitudes of administrators and negative attitudes of teachers cause students to be absent; students with negative socio-cultural and family structure have difficulty in complying with school rules and negative attitudes of school administrators cause absenteeism; students with negative socio-cultural and family structure are more likely to encounter negative attitudes of teachers and these situations cause absenteeism; as the school level increases (high school), the environment of the students causes them to be absent; students with negative physical and social environment are absent when faced with school rules and attitudes of administrators; the negative teacher attitudes of teachers towards students with negative socio-cultural and family structure cause absenteeism; students with negative socio-cultural and family structure have negative environmental conditions and this situation causes absenteeism; as the school level increases (high school), students' academic anxiety levels increase and this situation causes absenteeism; school rules and attitudes of administrators increase students' academic anxiety levels and cause absenteeism; teachers' negative attitudes increase students' academic anxiety and cause absenteeism; negative socio-cultural and family structure increases students' academic anxiety levels and causes absenteeism; negative physical and social environmental conditions increase students' academic anxiety levels and cause absenteeism; as the school level increases (high school), students exhibit more negative personal characteristics and this causes absenteeism; school rules and attitudes of administrators make it difficult for students to comply with the rules and this situation increases absenteeism; negative attitudes of teachers cause students to show more negative personal characteristics and to be absent; students with negative socio-cultural and family structure exhibit more negative personal characteristics and this situation causes absenteeism; negative environmental conditions and negative personal characteristics of students cause absenteeism; that students with negative personal characteristics have high academic anxiety levels and this situation causes absenteeism; the school rules and the attitudes of the administrators and the negative attitudes of the students' friends at school or outside the school cause absenteeism; the negative attitudes of teachers and the negative attitudes of students' friends at school or outside of school cause absenteeism; the negative attitudes of students with negative socio-cultural and family structure and their friends at school or outside of school cause absenteeism; the negative attitudes of students' friends at school or outside of school increase their academic anxiety levels and cause absenteeism; reveals that students' negative personal characteristics and negative environmental conditions cause absenteeism.

The low economic level may make it necessary for other individuals in families other than parents to work in any job. The fact that children are wanted to be employed in a job is a factor that significantly increases the risk of absenteeism from school (Bridgeland, 2010; Şirin et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2012; Tunç, 2011). Gottfried and Gee (2017) stated that one of the situations that can create a risk for school absenteeism is the socio-economic level of the family. It is observed that students in families with economic deficiencies do not attend school and drop out of school (Gennetian et al., 2018; Morrissey et al., 2014). Gubbels et al. (2019), on the other hand, stated that conflicts in the family can affect children's absence from school. It is also stated that socio-economic inequalities cause a decrease in the academic achievement of children (Chmielewski, 2019). The limited financial, social and educational opportunities of families also significantly affect the absenteeism rates of children (Gershenson et al., 2017; Smerillo et al., 2018). Rumberger (1983) stated that the low expectations of the parents for the educational activities of the students and the fact that the families do not participate in the educational processes cause the students not to attend school. At the same time, Taylı (2008) emphasized that the risk of absenteeism from school is low in families who participate more and contribute to the processes of the education activities of the students, and who perform the follow-up and supervision of the education processes of the students in a complete and effective way. Fernandez-Suarez et al. (2016) emphasized that student follow-up processes, which are put forward under the control and supervision of parents, increase the probability of their students to attend school. Blondal and Adalbjarnardottir (2009) stated that the probability of children being absent from school is lower in families who want their children to participate more in education, follow their education processes and show interest. Drèze and Kingdon (2001) stated that the low level of education of the parents brought about the fact that the children were less interested in education.

The inability of students to socialize is stated as one of the most important reasons for absenteeism and dropping out of school (Falch et al., 2010; Kara, 2019; Özer et al., 2011; Robison et al., 2017). In addition, students who exhibit anti-social behavior generally have difficulties in complying with school rules, not sharing/spending time with their peers, having difficulties in communicating and interacting, inability to manage themselves personally, and having difficulties in performing academic studies (Sprague and Perkins, 2009). In this context, Zorbaz (2018) states that students do not want to attend school and tend to drop out during the process. It is also stated that low academic achievement and experiencing academic anxiety are important determinants of absenteeism (Franklin and Trouard, 2016; Wood et al., 2017).

Low level of attachment to school and lack of sense of belonging to school can lead to the desire not to attend school (Magen-Nagar and Shachar, 2017). Kızıldağ et al. (2017) stated that the school and the administration are an important factor in absenteeism, that students' feeling of belonging to the school and increasing their motivation depend on the attitudes of the school method and the rules determined by this administration. It has also been stated that students with a high sense of belonging to school and good motivation for school engagement have a lower risk of absenteeism from school (McNeely and Falci, 2004).

Bullying and violence in and out of school are also important factors that affect students' school attendance (Beaty and Alexeyev, 2008). Students' reluctance to go to school and the fear of being exposed to physical violence at school are important determinants of absenteeism (Skybo, 2005). It is seen that the negative effects of peer bullying and violence during school age are not limited to some students only in school age, but also continue in the later life areas of students in the long term, and this situation creates serious psychological traumas (Rigby, 2003).

It is stated that having friends who do not attend school, run away from school and drop out creates a negative peer role model in students, and this situation increases the risk of school absenteeism and dropout (Hartup and Stevens, 1997; Reich and Vandell, 2014). It is also stated that students are affected much more than their peers, and spending a lot of time with their peers who are negative role models can negatively affect students' participation in educational processes (Laible et al., 2000; Moretti and Peled, 2004).

The effect of teacher-student communication has a very important power in students' attendance at school and seeing their teachers as role models. Şimşek (2011) stated that as the level of satisfaction with teachers, school administrators and the school in general decreases, the rate of absenteeism of students increases. Conflict-based teacher-student relations (McNeely and Falci, 2004) and inability to adapt to school (Jiang and Cillessen, 2005) are the basis of students' negative attitudes and behaviors towards school. It is stated that the positive/negative behavior models of teachers and school administration towards students are quite effective in the absence of students from school (Taş et al., 2013).

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, T. (2014). Educational inequality in rural and urban India. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 34, 11-19.
- Beaty, L. A., & Alexeyev, E. B. (2008). The problem of school bullies: What the research tells us. *Adolescence*, 43(169), 1-11.
- Blondal, K. S., & Adalbjarnardottir, S. (2009). Parenting practices and school dropout: A longitudinal study. *Family Therapy*, 36(3), 125-145.
- Bridgeland, J. M. (2010). The new dropout challenge: Bridging gaps among students, parents, and teachers. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 127, 101-110.
- Chmielewski, A. K. (2019). The global increase in the socioeconomic achievement gap, 1964 to 2015. *American Sociological Review*, 84(3), 517-544. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419847165>
- Corville-Smith, J., Ryan, B. A., Adams, G. R., & Dalicandro, T. (1998). Distinguishing absentee students from regular attenders: The combined influence of personal, family, and school factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 27(5), 629-641.
- Dekkers, H., & Claassen, A. (2001). Dropouts- disadvantaged by definition? A study of the perspective of early school leavers. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 27, 341-354.
- DeSocio, J., VanCura, M., Nelson, A. L., Hewitt, G., Kitzman, H., & Cole, R. (2007). Engaging truant adolescents: Results from a multifaceted intervention plot. *Preventing School Failure*, 51(3), 3-13.
- Drèze, J., & Kingdon, G. G. (2001). School participation in rural India. *Review of Development Economics*, 5, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9361.00103>
- Estevao, P., & Alvares, M. (2014). What do we mean by school dropout? Early School Leaving and the shifting of paradigms in school dropout measurement. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 13(1), 21-32. https://doi.org/10.1386/pjss.13.1.21_1
- Falch, T., Borge, L. E., Lujala, P., Nyhus, O. H., & Strom, B. (2010). Completion and dropout in upper secondary education in Norway: Causes and consequences, *Centre for Economic Research at NTNU, Trondheim*.
- Fernández-Suárez, A., Herrero, J., Pérez, B., Juarros-Basterretxea, J., & Rodríguez-Díaz, F. J. (2016). Risk factors for school dropout in a sample of juvenile offenders. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1993. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01993>
- Flaherty, C. W., Sutphen, R. D., & Ely, G. E. (2012). Examining substance abuse in truant youths and their caregivers: Implications for truancy intervention. *Children & Schools*, 34(4), 201-211.
- Franklin, B. J., & Trouard, S. B. (2016). Comparing dropout predictors for two state-level panels using grade 6 and grade 8 data. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 109(6), 631-639.
- Gage, N. A., Sugai, G., Lunde, K., & DeLoreto, L. (2013). Truancy and zero tolerance in high school: Does policy align with practice? *Education and Treatment of Children*, 36(2), 117-138.
- Gennetian, L. A., Rodrigues, C., Hill, H. D., & Morris, P. A. (2018). Stability of income and school attendance among NYC students of low-income families. *Economics of Education Review*, 63(1), 20-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2018.01.003>
- Gershenson, S., Jackowitz, A., & Brannegan, A. (2017). Are student absences worth the worry in US primary schools? *Education Finance and Policy*, 12(2), 137-165.
- Gottfried, M. A., & Gee, K. A. (2017). Identifying the determinants of chronic absenteeism: A bioecological systems approach. *Teachers College Record*, 119(7), 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811711900704>
- Göçen, A., & Kaya, A. (2019). Öğrenci devamsızlığının azaltılmasına yönelik uluslararası stratejiler ve uygulama örnekleri. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 48(1), 353-370.
- Gubbels, J., van der Put, C. E., & Assink, M. (2019). Risk Factors for school absenteeism and dropout: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*, 48, 1637-1667. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01072-5>
- Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121, 355-370.

- Jiang, X. L., & Cillessen, A. H. (2005). Stability of continuous measures of sociometric status: A meta-analysis. *Developmental Review, 25*, 1–25.
- Kara, Y. (2019). Zihinsel yeti yitimi olan çocuğa yönelik sosyal hizmet uygulaması: Bir vaka sunumu. *Toplum ve Sosyal Hizmet, 30*(1), 353-373. DOI: 10.33417/tsh.516778
- Karapür, Ş. (2017). Erken Okul Terkinin Azaltılmasına Yönelik AB Ülkeleri ile Türkiye'deki Politika ve Önlemlerin Karşılaştırılması ve Okul Eğitimi Projelerinin Bu Kapsamdaki Rolü (*Yayınlanmamış Uzmanlık Tezi*). Avrupa Birliği Bakanlığı, Ankara.
- Kearney, C. A. (2003). Bridging the gap among professionals who address youths with school absenteeism: Overview and suggestions for consensus. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 34*(1), 57.
- Kızıldağ, S., Demirtaş-Zorbaz, S., & Zorbaz, O. (2017). Lise öğrencilerinde okul bağlılığı. *Eğitim ve Bilim, 42*(189), 107-119.
- Laible, D., Carlo, G., & Raffaelli, M. (2000). The differential relations of parent and peer attachment to adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 29*, 45–59.
- Magen-Nagar, N., & Shachar, H. (2017). Quality of teaching and dropout risk: A multi-level analysis. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 22*(1), 9-24.
- McNeely, C., & Falci, C. (2004). School connectedness and transition into and out of health risk behavior among adolescents: A comparison of social belonging and teacher support. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 284-292.
- Ministry of Education. (2022). Devamsızlık Nedenleri Anketi. https://orgm.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2018_11/30144839_DevamsYzYk_Nedenleri_Anketi30.11.18.pdf, (Access Date: 12.09.2022).
- Moock, P. R., & Leslie, J. (1986). Childhood malnutrition and schooling in the Terai region of Nepal. *Journal of Development Economics, 20*(1), 33-52.
- Moretti, M. M., & Peled, M (2004). Adolescent-parent attachment: Bonds that support healthy development. *Paediatr Child Health, 9*(8), 551-554.
- Morrissey, T. W., Hutchison, L., & Winsler, A. (2014). Family income, school attendance, and academic achievement in elementary school. *Developmental Psychology, 50*(3), 741–753. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033848>
- Özer, A., Gençtanırım, D., & Ergene, T. (2011). Türk lise öğrencilerinde okul terkinin yordanması: Aracı ve etkileşim değişkenleri ile bir model testi. *Education in Science: The Bulletin of the Association for Science Education, 36*(161), 302.
- Özer, M. (1991). İlköğretim Okulları İkinci Kademe (Ortaokul) Öğrencilerinin Öğrenimi Terk Etme Sorununun Analizi (*Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Ramachandran, V. (2009). Right to education act: A comment. *Economic and Political Weekly, 44*(28). DOI: 10.2307/40279266
- Rao, B. T., Valleswary, K., Nayak, M. S. D. P., & Rao, N. L. (2016). Reasons for absenteeism among the undergraduate medical students attending for theory classes in Rajiv Gandhi Institute of Medical Sciences (RIMS) Ongole, Prakasam District of Andhra Pradesh: A self review. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), 6*, 11-19.
- Reich, S. M., & Vandell, D. L. (2014). The interplay between parents and peers as socializing influences in children's development. In P. K. Smith & C. H. Hart (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of childhood social development* (pp. 263–280). Wiley Blackwell.
- Rigby, K. (2003). Consequences of bullying in schools. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 48*(9), 583-590. DOI: 10.1177/070674370304800904
- Robison, S., Jagers, J., Rhodes, J., Blackmon, B. J., & Church, W. (2017). Correlates of educational success: Predictors of school dropout and graduation for urban students in the deep south. *Children and Youth Services Review, 73*, 37-46.
- Roby, D. E. (2004). Research on school attendance and student achievement: A study of Ohio schools. *Educational Research Quarterly, 28*(1), 3-16.

- Rumberger, R. W. (1983). Dropping out of high school: The influence of race, sex, and family background. *American Educational Research Journal*, 20, 199-220.
- Singh, R., & Mukherjee, P. (2018). ‘Whatever she may study, she can’t escape from washing dishes’: Gender inequity in secondary education – evidence from a longitudinal study in India. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 48(2), 262-280. DOI: 10.1080/03057925.2017.1306434
- Skybo, T. (2005). Witnessing violence: Biopsychosocial impact on children. *Pediatric Nursing*, 31(4), 263-270.
- Smerillo, N. E., Reynolds, A. J., Temple, J. A., & Ou, S. R. (2018). Chronic absence, eighth-grade achievement, and high school attainment in the Chicago Longitudinal Study. *Journal of School Psychology*, 67, 163–178. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2017.11.001>
- Sprague, J., & Perkins, K. (2009). Direct and collateral effects of the first step to success program. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 11(4), 208-221.
- Şimşek, H. (2011). Lise öğrencilerinde okulu bırakma eğilimi ve nedenleri. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi, Uluslararası E-Dergi*, 1(2), 27-48.
- Şirin, H., Özdemir, S., & Sezgin, F. (2009). Okulu Terk Eden Çocukların ve Velilerinin Okul Terkine İlişkin Görüşleri: Nitel Bir İnceleme, XVIII. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kurultayı, Ege Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, İzmir.
- Taş, A., Selvitopu, A., Bora, V., & Demirkaya, Y. (2013). Meslek lisesi öğrencilerinin okul terk nedenleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 13(3), 1551-1566.
- Taylı, A. (2008). Eğitim sisteminde önemli bir sorun: Okulu bırakma. *Türk Psikolojik ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 3(30), 89-101.
- Taylor, G., Lekes, N., Gagnon, H., Kwan, L., & Koestner, R. (2012). Need satisfaction, work–school interference and school dropout: An application of self-determination theory. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 622-646.
- Tunç, E. (2011). Okulu Terk Etmiş Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Benlik Algıları ve Rehberlik Gereksinimlerinin Karşılama Düzeyi (*Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Ünver, G. (2022). Okula Devamsızlık ve Okul Terki Nedenleri: Bir Meta-Sentez İncelemesi (*Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*). İstanbul Medeniyet Üniversitesi.
- Wood, L., Kiperman, S., Esch, R. C., Leroux, A. J., & Truscott, S. D. (2017). Predicting dropout using student-and school-level factors: An ecological perspective. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 32(1), 35-51.
- Zorbaz, O. (2018). Lise Öğrencilerinin Okul Terk Risklerini Etkileyen Öğrenci ve Okul Düzeyindeki Faktörler (*Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.