

AN ANALYSIS ON THE SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS BURNOUT IN TERMS OF ACADEMIC SELF-EFFICACY, PARENTAL MONITORING, SOCIAL SUPPORT AND LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES

Meral SERT AĞIR

Phd., Marmara University, meralagir@marmara.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0003-0065-8913

Received: 27.07.2018

Accepted: 25.12.2018

ABSTRACT

Studies emphasize that school burnout is more intense in secondary and high school education where choices related to the future and expectations become significant in addition to the developmental problems. This study was carried out based on the opinion that expectations and anxiety about the importance of preparation and high performance can cause school burnout in students from the 6th grade to the end of the 8th grade. In this context, the secondary school students' burnout was examined in terms of academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring, social support, leisure activities and demographical characteristics in the study. 396 students from the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade of secondary school in İstanbul province, Kadıköy district participated in this study. The study was designed in a descriptive research model and the data were analyzed in the SPSS program by using t test, variance and correlation analysis techniques. The data of the study was obtained using School Burnout Scale, Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, Parental Monitoring Scale, Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale and personal information form. The correlation analysis show that there were a significant positive association between Burnout School and Academic Self-Efficacy, ($r(396) = .44, p=.000$), between Burnout School and Frequency of perception, ($r(396) = .32, p = .000$), and between Burnout School and importance, ($r(396) = .34, p=.000$). It was found that the level of burn out was higher in female students compared to the male students and parental monitoring was at different dimensions for female and male students. There was also a significance in academic self-efficacy when the education level of the mother increases, and in feeling of insufficiency and academic self-efficacy when the education level of father increases. Also there was a significant difference found in terms of age, grade, family employment status, academic achievement and leisure activities ($p<0.05$).

Keywords: School burnout, academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring, social support, leisure time activities.

INTRODUCTION

Adolescence is a challenging period in which choices that determine the future are made between different educational levels apart from being a transition period between childhood and adulthood for the young. For the students in the first period of adolescence, the secondary education level requires adaptation to different curriculum after primary education and the acquisition of different learning habits. The fact that the performance in secondary education is one of the determining factors during the phase of transition to a higher education level namely high school, loads a new one as an academic performance concern, to the developmental concerns of the adolescent. These academic performance indicators represent their future for students. Changes in the meaning of academic performance not only in the family and teachers but also in the circle of peers can increase the adaptation problems of the students. Therefore, students need support for problems related to teaching environment as well as developmental issues in the first period of adolescence. As a result, all of the stakeholders of education including family, teachers and school administrators should be in cooperation for the issues related to the students. The study focusing on secondary school students burn out in terms of academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring, social support and leisure activities could contribute to the further researches to be conducted regarding secondary school students.

School burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support

The feeling of burnout could affect the life of an individual due to a steady decline in physical, mental and emotional strength. Moreover, it prevents performing daily activities of an individual (Freudenberger, 1974; Maslach, 1981; Johnson, 2012). Both the organizations and the employees of the organizations have to cope with this situation in business life and it could prevent the fulfillment of responsibilities in the direction of expectations by having a negative impact on productivity (Friedman, 1991). While educational institutions try to increase the quality of education by solving problems of principals and teachers regarding burnout syndrome (Farber, 2000; İzgar, 2001; Aksu, Baysal, 2005; Kokkinos, 2007; Betarot, 2006; Başol, Altay, 2009; Çağlar, 2011), they are also faced with a new problem: symptoms of burnout syndrome in students (Lee, Puig, Kim, Shin and Lee, 2010). Within this context, burnout syndrome which is a case to be solved in education in order to acquire the qualifications in the students, has become one of the significant issues of education (Aypay, Server, 2015). School burnout is a process developing due to many factors (Zhang, Gan and Cham, 2007). It can be characterized by a decrease in interest and motivation in teaching activities, a gradual decline in performance and a desire to move away from the school environment in relation to education depending on students' feeling weary, tired and unwilling as mentally, emotionally and physically (Salmelo-Aro, Savolainen, Holopainen, 2009). Studies on the topic can be addressed in two groups as adaptation of scale and applications in business life to the school environment and scale and practices developed in accordance with the characteristics of teaching environment. Studies in terms of teaching environment have been focused on the students at the level of secondary school and high school where the developmental adaptation problems for students are experienced intensively (Aypay, Eryılmaz, 2011; Aypay, 2012; Öztan, 2014; Özdemir, 2015). The

studies have shown that the characteristics of the family and the teaching environment may influence burnout in students and the perceived academic competence. (McCarthy, Pretty and Catano, 1990; Bask, Salmelo-Aro, 2013) When the relevant literature is examined, the studies dealing with the parental and educational environment characteristics of school burnout emphasize a negative relationship among family and school environment and school burnout (Salmelo-Aro, Savolainen, Holopainen, 2009). The studies dealing with school burnout in relation to academic motivation show that there is a decline in school burnout in environments where academic motivation is supported (Yang, 2004; Korhonen, Tapola, Linnanmaiki, Aunio, 2016).

In line with the studies on school burnout, we see that the definition of self-efficacy of students as individuals in an educational environment developing through their lives is also effective in terms of coping with the burnout in the education process, in addition to the emotional, social, academic support. (Pajares, 1996). An individual's own definition of competency is explained by the concept of self-efficacy as the information on what, how, how well one can do something and is improved through experiences in the developing process (Bandura, 2005). Self-efficacy is also the representative of the individual's self-confidence. The relevant literature emphasizes that the belief and perception of self-efficacy is a driving force when it comes to keeping on tackling with the everyday challenges without being frustrated. (Zimmerman & Timothy, 2005; Connolly, 1989). The school as a learning environment is one of the most significant areas of life in the formation of self-efficacy definitions regarding various areas; it requires more effort, on one hand, trying to be academically competent by achieving learning goals and meeting the expectations of the family and the teacher and on the other hand being a socially competent individual by being valuable and accepted among peers. In a student's perspective, academic success and performance regarding learning activities become the criterion for academic competence. Academic self-efficacy is the belief and perception of competence regarding academic knowledge and skills developed in line with the feedback not only from family and teacher but also from the peers regarding what they can and cannot do in their learning activities (Pajares & Schunk, 2001; Bong & Skaalvik, 2003; Öncü, 2012). Related studies suggest that the perception of academic self-efficacy increases academic success, by developing the sense of commitment of starting and finishing a task and thus becoming a motivating feature of doing more difficult tasks. Therefore, the perception of academic self-efficacy, which is influential on students' attitudes towards their attainment of educational goals is closely related to the emotions of burnout in school life (Pintrich & Zusho, 2002).

In this context, learning and dynamics of learning may lead to a more intense experience of burnout which is intertwined with many factors. It is seen that the sense of burnout in the school environment should be handled in a multidimensional manner when it comes to the student being served by the education institution in terms being prepared for life and in the position of a learner. From this point of view, the secondary school students' burnout was examined in terms of academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring, social support, leisure activities and demographical characteristics. The main aim of the study is to examine whether there is a relationship between school burn out of the secondary school students and academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring, social support and leisure time. Moreover, the sub-purposes of the study within the scope of the

main aim is to examine whether the relevant characteristics differentiate in accordance with the variables such as gender, age, grade, parental education level, parental occupation status, perceived academic success, weekly studying period (doing homework) and leisure activities.

METHOD

Research model

The study aiming to examine secondary school student burnout in terms of academic self-sufficiency, parental monitoring, social support and leisure activities is a descriptive study within the relational research model. Descriptive studies are the research models aiming to examine the current situation as it is.

Study group

Institutional permission was obtained from the Provincial Directorate of National Education of İstanbul Governorship for this study with the Number: 59090411-20-E.4411984 and Date: 04.19.2016. The study group of this research consists of 396 students from the 6th, 7th, and 8th grade secondary school students in İstanbul province, Kadıköy district. The results of this study are limited to the scales used in the study group and in the research. 52,30 % of the study group consisted of female students and 47,70% of male students. When the percentage distribution of the students according to the grade variable was analyzed, it was understood that the majority was from the 7th grade 52,89% (see Table 1).

Table1. Demographic Characteristics of Students

Gender	f	%	Age	f	%	Grade	f	%
Female	189	47.70	12	121	30.58	6th grade	98	24.71
Male	207	52.30	13	165	41.70	7th grade	209	52.89
Total	396	100.0	14	110	27.72	8th grade	89	22.40
			Total	396	100.00	Total	251	100.0

Data collection tools

Secondary School Student Burnout Scale

In order to measure school burnout, the scale was prepared as 4-point Likert type which consists of 34 items and seven sub-dimensions - Loss of interest to school, burnout from studying, burnout from family, burnout from teacher attitudes, need to rest and time for fun, feeling of insufficiency at school- developed by Aypay (2012). The Cronbach's alfa of scale was for the sub-dimensions of the instrument ranged from 0.67 to 0.86. In this study group the Cronbach's alfa of the scale is 0.934

Academic Self-Efficacy Scale

It is a 4-point Likert type scale, validated by Öncü (2012) and consists of 21 items and three sub-dimensions - ability, context and educational quality. working group of the study consisted of elementary school students from fifth to eight grades. The Cronbach's alfa of scale was 0.82. In this study group the Cronbach's alfa of the scale is 0.885.

Parental Monitoring Scale

It is a 4-point Likert type scale, standardized by Karataş and Öztürk (2011), consisting of 27 items, seven sub-dimensions -indirect monitoring, direct monitoring, school monitoring, health monitoring, computer monitoring, phone monitoring, restrictive monitoring- in order to measure parental monitoring feature. The total variance of the Turkish form of the instrument was found to be 56.9 % and the original construct was supported by the factor analysis. In this study group the cronbach's alfa of the scale is 0.786.

Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale

It consists of 60 items and five sub-dimensions- family, teacher, classmate, close friend, other people at school- and standardized by Cırık, Oktay and Fer (2011) in order to measure the frequency of perception and importance of the social support. The level of frequency of perception social support has been arranged as 6-point Likert and its importance of the social support as 3-point Likert in the scale. The study group of this research consisted of secondary school students from fifth to eight grades. The Cronbach's alfa of scale was 0.96 for all grades. In this study group the Cronbach's alfa of the scale is 0.977

Data analysis

Data analysis was performed using t test, one-way analysis of variance and correlation techniques in the statistical software SPSS 21. Whether there is a differentiation for school burnout, academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring and the social support in terms of gender was examined by t test and whether there is a difference in terms of age, grade, academic achievement (according to student perception); parents' educational level, parents' employment status for school burnout according to educational branch activities and leisure time activities; academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring and the frequency of perception child and adolescent social support was analyzed by using one-way variance analysis. In addition, a correlation technique was used to determine whether there was a relationship among school burnout, academic self-efficacy, and parental monitoring characteristics.

FINDINGS (RESULTS)

As a result of the t-test applied to determine whether the students of the sample group had a significant difference in the average total scores of school burnout, academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring and social

support according to the gender variable, there was a significant difference found in terms of related characteristics. The average scores of female students were found to be significantly different compared to male students in School Burnout Scale total scores ($t(390.06) = -2.246$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 91.37$; Female $\bar{x} = 95.75$) and in its two sub dimensions burnout from family ($t(392.42) = -3.072$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 12.69$; Female $\bar{x} = 13.92$) and burnout from homework ($t(394) = -2.928$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 13.66$; Female $\bar{x} = 14.69$). The average scores of female students were found to be significantly different from male students in direct monitoring ($t(394) = -2.080$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 7.36$; Female $\bar{x} = 7.92$) sub dimension of parental monitoring scale. It has been found that the average scores of female students differ significantly from male students in Academic Self-Efficacy Scale Total Score Averages ($t(393.47) = -2.639$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 57.97$ Female $\bar{x} = 60.47$) and one of its sub dimensions Context score average ($t(368.62) = -6.416$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 18.66$ Female $\bar{x} = 21.96$). It has been found that the average scores of male students differ significantly from female students in Parental Monitoring ($t(394) = 2.396$; $p < .05$), School Monitoring ($t(394) = 2.003$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 10.34$ Female $\bar{x} = 9.66$), Health Monitoring ($t(394) = 2.298$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 9.8$ Female $\bar{x} = 8.29$), Computer Monitoring ($t(394) = 3.648$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 7.29$; Female $\bar{x} = 6.27$), and Restrictive Monitoring ($t(325.42) = 4.089$; $p < .05$; Male $\bar{x} = 4.48$; Female $\bar{x} = 3.68$), sub-dimensions of Parental Monitoring (see Table 2).

Table 2. t test results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Gender Variable

Scales/Subdimensions	Group	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	t test		
					t	df	p
Burnout School	Male	189	91.37	17.51	-2.246	390.06	.025
	Female	207	95.75	21.24			
Burnout from family	Male	189	12.69	3.66	-3.072	392.42	.002
	Female	207	13.92	4.27			
Burnout from homework	Male	189	13.66	3.31	-2.928	394	.004
	Female	207	14.69	3.66			
Parental monitoring	Male	189	54.74	14.06	2.396	394	.017
	Female	207	51.47	13.11			
Direct monitoring	Male	189	7.36	2.75	-2.080	394	.038
	Female	207	7.92	2.64			
School monitoring	Male	189	10.34	3.28	2.003	394	.046
	Female	207	9.66	3.43			
Health monitoring	Male	189	9.08	3.41	2.298	394	.022
	Female	207	8.29	3.46			
Computer monitoring	Male	189	7.29	2.98	3.648	394	.000
	Female	207	6.27	2.59			
Restrictive monitoring	Male	189	4.48	2.28	4.089	325.42	.000
	Female	207	3.68	1.53			
Academic self-efficacy	Male	189	57.97	8.82	-2.639	393.47	.009
	Female	207	60.47	10.03			
Context	Male	189	18.66	5.51	-6.416	368.62	.000
	Female	207	21.96	4.63			

As a result test of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in the average of school burnout, parental monitoring, academic self-efficacy and child and adolescence social support, total scores of the students forming the sample group according to age variable, there were significant differences found between arithmetic averages of the groups in the characteristics of School Burnout Scale ($F=3.460$; $p<.05$) and its sub dimensions loss of interest to school ($F=5.015$; $p<.05$), Burnout from studying ($F=5.522$; $p<.05$), Burnout from family ($F=3.320$; $p<.05$), burnout from homework ($F=4.185$; $p<.05$); Direct Monitoring sub dimension of Parental Monitoring Scale ($F=3.148$; $p<.05$) and frequency of perception of Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale ($F=3.534$; $p<.05$) (see Table 3).

Table 3. Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Age Variable

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Subdimensions	Group	<i>N</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	<i>P</i>
Burnout school	12	121	96.17	22.27	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2638.17	2	1319.09 381.21	3.460	0.032
	13	165	94.49	18.52		149816.80	393			
	14	110	89.65	17.67		152454.98	395			
	Total	396	93.66	19.65						
Loss of interest to school	12	121	18.03	4.94	Between Groups Within Groups Total	213.09	2	106.54 21.24	5.015	0.007
	13	165	17.68	4.33		8348.80	393			
	14	110	16.23	4.64		8561.89	395			
	Total	396	17.39	4.66						
Burnout from studying	12	121	17.17	4.22	Between Groups Within Groups Total	192.99	2	96.50 17.47	5.522	0.004
	13	165	15.75	4.09		6867.44	393			
	14	110	15.55	4.27		7060.43	395			
	Total	396	16.13	4.23						
Burnout from family	12	121	13.42	4.12	Between Groups Within Groups Total	106.74	2	53.37 16.07	3.320	0.037
	13	165	13.80	3.95		6317.26	393			
	14	110	12.54	3.97		6424.00	395			
	Total	396	13.33	4.03						
Burnout from homework	12	121	14.90	3.62	Between Groups Within Groups Total	102.65	2	51.33 12.26	4.185	0.016
	13	165	14.08	3.46		4819.38	393			
	14	110	13.59	3.42		4922.03	395			
	Total	396	14.19	3.53						
Direct monitoring	12	121	7.24	2.69	Between Groups Within Groups Total	45.43	2	22.72 7.22	3.148	0.044
	13	165	8.03	2.57		2836.17	393			
	14	110	7.55	2.85		2881.60	395			
	Total	396	7.65	2.70						
Frequency of perception	12	121	248.34	61.14	Between Groups Within Groups Total	27577.27	2	13788.64 3901.33	3.534	0.030
	13	165	251.14	60.95		1533222.39	393			
	14	110	231.51	66.04		1560799.66	395			
	Total	396	244.83	62.86						

As a result of the Tukey Post-Hoc analysis performed after the variance analysis to determine whether there were significant differences among the groups, there were significant differences found in, School Burnout Scale of the groups (12 years $\bar{x}$ =96.17; 13 years $\bar{x}$ =94.49; 14 Years $\bar{x}$ =93.66) and one of its sub dimensions Loss of Interest to School (12 years $\bar{x}$ =18.03; 13 years $\bar{x}$ =94.17.68; 14 years $\bar{x}$ =16.23), Burnout from studying (12 years $\bar{x}$ =17.17; 13 years $\bar{x}$ =15.75; 14 years $\bar{x}$ =15.55), Burnout from family (12 years $\bar{x}$ =13.42; 13 years $\bar{x}$ =13.80; 14 years $\bar{x}$ =12.54) Burnout from homework (12 years $\bar{x}$ =14.90; 13 years $\bar{x}$ =14.08; 14 years $\bar{x}$ =13.59) sub dimensions. Moreover, significant differences were found between groups' arithmetic averages in the characteristics of Direct Monitoring sub dimension (12 years $\bar{x}$ =7.21; 13 years $\bar{x}$ =8.03; 14 years $\bar{x}$ =7.55) of Parental Monitoring Scale and frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale (12 years $\bar{x}$ =248.34; 13 years $\bar{x}$ =251.14; 14 years $\bar{x}$ =231.51) (see Table 3).

As a result test of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine whether there were significant differences in the average of school burnout, parental monitoring, academic self-efficacy and child and adolescence social support total scores of the students forming the sample group according to grade variable, there were significances found in terms of School Burnout Scale ($F=3.485$; $p<.05$) total scores and its sub dimensions Loss of Interest to School ($F=4.920$; $p<.05$), Burnout from studying ($F=4.201$; $p<.05$), Burnout from homework ($F=4.678$; $p<.05$) and Burnout from teacher attitudes ($F=3.476$; $p<.05$) (see Table 4).

Table 4. Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Grade Variable

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Subdimensions	Group	N	$\bar{x}$	SD		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	P
School burnout	6thgrade	98	95.88	22.91	Between					
	7th grade	209	94.63	18.89	Groups	2656.84	2	1328.42		
	8th grade	89	88.94	16.75	Within	149798.14	393	381.17	3.485	0.032
	Total	396	93.66	19.65	Groups Total	152454.98	395			
Loss of interest to school	6th grade	98	17.91	4.95	Between					
	7th grade	209	17.71	4.46	Groups	209.12	2	104.56		
	8th grade	89	16.04	4.57	Within	8352.77	393	21.25	4.920	0.008
	Total	396	17.39	4.66	Groups Total	8561.89	395			
Burnout from studying	6th grade	98	16.96	4.19	Between					
	7thgrade	209	16.14	4.15	Groups	147.78	2	73.89		
	8thgrade	89	15.18	4.31	Within	6912.65	393	17.59	4.201	0.016
	Total	396	16.13	4.23	Groups Total	7060.43	395			
Burnout from homework	6thgrade	98	14.58	3.69	Between					
	7thgrade	209	14.44	3.42	Groups	114.44	2	57.22		
	8thgrade	89	13.20	3.46	Within	4807.58	393	12.23	4.678	0.010
	Total	396	14.19	3.53	Groups Total	4922.03	395			
Burnout from teacher attitude	6thgrade	98	10.81	3.31	Between					
	7thgrade	209	10.44	3.30	Groups	69.77	2	34.89		
	8thgrade	89	9.62	2.63	Within	3943.83	393	10.04	3.476	0.032
	Total	396	10.35	3.19	Groups Total	4013.60	395			

As a result of the Tukey Post-Hoc analysis performed after the variance analysis to determine whether there were significant differences among the groups, there were significant differences found in terms of properties according to grade variable, in School Burnout Scale Total scores (6th grade $\bar{x}$ =95.88; 7th grade $\bar{x}$ =94.63; 8th grade $\bar{x}$ =88.94) and Loss of Interest to School (6th grade $\bar{x}$ =17.91; 7th grade $\bar{x}$ =17.71; 8th grade $\bar{x}$ =16.04), Burnout from studying (6th grade $\bar{x}$ =16.96; 7th grade $\bar{x}$ =16.14; 8th grade $\bar{x}$ =15.18), Burnout from homework (6th grade $\bar{x}$ =14.58; 7th grade $\bar{x}$ =14.44; 8th grade $\bar{x}$ =13.20) sub dimensions and Feeling of Insufficiency at School and Burnout from teacher attitudes (6th grade $\bar{x}$ =10.81; 7th grade $\bar{x}$ =10.44; 8th grade $\bar{x}$ =9.62) (see Table 4).

As can be seen in Table 5, as a result of the variance analysis of the students consisting of the study group whether there was a difference in terms of achievement variable, a significant difference was found among arithmetic averages of School Burnout Scale ($F=7.779$; $p<.05$) total scores and its sub dimensions burnout from studying ($F=5.434$; $p<.05$), burnout from family ($F=8.432$; $p<.05$), burnout from teacher attitudes ($F=6.736$; $p<.05$), Need to rest and time for fun ($F=4.730$; $p<.05$) and Feeling of Insufficiency at School ($F=9.477$; $p<.05$). Moreover, according to the results of the analysis, there was a significant difference found between Parental monitoring scale sub dimension, Academic Self-Efficacy Scale and sub dimension academic achievement, and frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale According to the results, significant differences were found in Indirect Monitoring ($F=3.883$; $p<.05$, Direct Monitoring ($F=3.475$; $p<.05$), Restrictive Monitoring ($F=2.747$; $p<.05$) from Parental Monitoring Scale and Academic Self-Efficacy total scores ($F=54.422$; $p<.05$) and sub dimensions Ability ($F=53,266$; $p<.05$), Education Quality ($F=7.980$; $p<.05$), and frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale ($F=3.294$; $p<.05$).

Table 5. Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Achievement Variable

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Sub dimensions	Group	<i>N</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>		Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	<i>P</i>
School burnout	Very good	107	100.46	20.90	Between Groups Within Groups Total	11238.45 141216.53 152454.98	4 391 395	2809.61 361.17	7.779	0.000
	Good	207	93.14	18.86						
	Average	67	85.66	15.46						
	Bad	7	77.43	27.02						
	Very bad	8	97.25	14.42						
	Total	396	93.66	19.65						
Burnout from studying	Very good	107	17.21	4.47	Between Groups Within Groups Total	371.84 6688.59 7060.43	4 391 395	92.96 17.11	5.434	0.000
	Good	207	16.08	4.12						
	Average	67	14.58	3.29						
	Bad	7	13.43	5.68						
	Very bad	8	18.25	4.77						
	Total	396	16.13	4.23						
Burnout from family	Very good	107	14.93	3.81	Between Groups Within Groups Total	510.14 5913.86 6424.00	4 391 395	127.54 15.12	8.432	0.000
	Good	207	13.12	3.96						
	Average	67	11.70	3.55						
	Bad	7	10.71	4.64						
	Very bad	8	13.38	5.01						
	Total	396	13.33	4.03						

Burnout from teacher attitude	Very good	107	11.44	3.18	Between Groups Within Groups Total	258.77 3754.84 4013.60	4 391 395	64.69 9.60	6.736	0.000
	Good	207	10.16	3.04						
	Average	67	9.19	3.14						
	Bad	7	8.57	4.16						
	Very bad	8	11.63	1.85						
	Total	396	10.35	3.19						
Need to rest and time for fun	Very good	107	11.92	3.06	Between Groups Within Groups Total	169.49 3502.54 3672.03	4 391 395	42.37 8.96	4.730	0.001
	Good	207	11.26	3.00						
	Average	67	10.15	2.85						
	Bad	7	8.86	3.58						
	Very bad	8	10.75	2.49						
	Total	396	11.19	3.05						
Feeling of insufficiency at school	Very good	107	11.98	2.91	Between Groups Within Groups Total	331.89 3423.35 3755.24	4 391 395	82.97 8.76	9.477	0.000
	Good	207	10.67	2.90						
	Average	67	9.31	3.05						
	Bad	7	8.71	3.90						
	Very bad	8	10.38	3.58						
	Total	396	10.76	3.08						
Indirect monitoring	Very good	107	13.80	4.36	Between Groups Within Groups Total	275.21 6927.36 7202.57	4 391 395	68.80 17.72	3.883	0.004
	Good	207	12.22	3.94						
	Average	67	13.18	4.79						
	Bad	7	14.14	2.85						
	Very bad	8	16.00	4.66						
	Total	396	12.92	4.27						
Direct monitoring	Very good	107	8.44	2.61	Between Groups Within Groups Total	98.93 2782.67 2881.60	4 391 395	24.73 7.12	3.475	0.008
	Good	207	7.45	2.57						
	Average	67	7.10	2.91						
	Bad	7	6.86	2.91						
	Very bad	8	7.63	3.66						
	Total	396	7.65	2.70						
Restrictive monitoring	Very good	107	4,07	2,04	Between Groups Within Groups Total	41,62 1480,92 1522,55	4 391 395	10,41 3,79	2,747	0.028
	Good	207	3,87	1,72						
	Average	67	4,64	2,40						
	Bad	7	5,00	2,77						
	Very bad	8	3,25	0,46						
	Total	396	4,06	1,96						
Academic self-efficacy	Very good	107	67,48	7,40	Between Groups Within Groups Total	12860,24 23098,76 35959,00	4 391 395	3215,06 59,08	54,422	0,000
	Good	207	58,03	7,53						
	Average	67	51,03	6,17						
	Bad	7	48,71	16,67						
	Very bad	8	60,13	14,35						
	Total	396	59,28	9,54						
Ability	Very good	107	35,98	5,68	Between Groups Within Groups Total	8690,05 15947,37 24637,42	4 391 395	2172,51 40,79	53,266	0,000
	Good	207	27,94	6,49						
	Average	67	22,42	6,10						
	Bad	7	22,29	9,59						
	Very bad	8	27,25	10,89						
	Total	396	29,06	7,90						
Education quality	Very good	107	10,64	1,67	Between Groups Within Groups Total	135,57 1660,75 1796,32	4 391 395	33,89 4,25	7,980	0,000
	Good	207	9,59	2,12						
	Average	67	9,36	2,37						
	Bad	7	7,71	2,87						
	Very bad	8	10,75	1,67						
	Total	396	9,83	2,13						
Frequency of perception	Very good	107	259,94	63,49	Between Groups Within Groups Total	50880,18 1509919,49 1560799,66	4 391 395	12720,04 3861,69	3,294	0,011
	Good	207	242,52	61,11						
	Average	67	226,31	61,42						
	Bad	7	240,43	88,64						
	Very bad	8	261,50	49,72						
	Total	396	244,83	62,86						

In accordance with the findings of Tukey Post-Hoc analysis performed after the variance analysis to determine whether there were a significant differences among the groups, there were significant differences in the arithmetic averages of School Burnout Scale total scores (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =100.46; Good $\bar{x}$ =93.14; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =85.66; Bad $\bar{x}$ =77.43; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =97.25) and its subdimensions Burnout from studying (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =17.21; Good $\bar{x}$ =16.08; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =14.58; Bad $\bar{x}$ =13.43; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =18.25), Burnout from family (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =14.93; Good $\bar{x}$ =13.12; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =11.70; Bad $\bar{x}$ =10.71; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =13.38), Burnout from Teacher Attitudes (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =11.44; Good $\bar{x}$ =10.16; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =9.19; Bad $\bar{x}$ =8.57; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =11.63) and need to rest and time for fun (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =11.92; Good $\bar{x}$ =11.26; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =10.15; Bad $\bar{x}$ =8.86; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =10.75) and Feeling of Insufficiency at School (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =11.98; Good $\bar{x}$ =10.67; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =9.31; Bad $\bar{x}$ =8.71; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =10.38) . There was a significant difference found in Indirect Monitoring Scale total score (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =13.80; Good $\bar{x}$ =12.22; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =13.18; Bad $\bar{x}$ =14.14; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =16.00) and its sub-dimensions Direct Monitoring (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =8.440; Good $\bar{x}$ =7.45; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =7.10; Bad $\bar{x}$ =6.86; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =7.63), Restrictive Monitoring (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =4.07; Good $\bar{x}$ =3.87; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =4.64; Bad $\bar{x}$ =5.00; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =3.25). There was a significant difference found between the arithmetic averages of the groups in terms of achievement variable in Academic Self-Efficacy total score (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =67.48; Good $\bar{x}$ =58.03; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =51.03; Bad $\bar{x}$ =48.71; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =60.13) and its sub dimensions Ability (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =35.98; Good $\bar{x}$ =27.94; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =22.42; Bad $\bar{x}$ =22.29; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =27.25), Education Quality (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =10.64; Good $\bar{x}$ =9.59; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =9.36; Bad $\bar{x}$ =7.71; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =10.75), and in the frequency of perception of Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale (Very Good $\bar{x}$ =63.49; Good $\bar{x}$ =61.11; Not Bad $\bar{x}$ =61.42; Bad $\bar{x}$ =88.64; Very Bad $\bar{x}$ =49.72) (see Table 5).

As can be seen in Table 6, as a result of the analysis of variance of the students of the study group according to the level of education of the mother, there was a significant difference in the ability ($F=5.983$; $p<.05$) and Education Quality ($F=3.587$; $p<.05$) sub-dimension of Academic Self-Efficacy Scale.

Table 6. Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Mother's Educational Level Variable

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Sub dimensions	Group	N	$\bar{x}$	SD		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	P
Ability	No education	15	27.20	9.56	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1421.08 23216.34 24637.42	4 391 395	355.27 59.38	5.983	0.000
	Primary School	94	27.03	7.57						
	Secondary	79	27.27	6.48						
	School	109	30.14	7.60						
	High School	99	31.53	8.51						
	University	396	29.06	7.90						
	Total									
Education Quality	No education	15	9.60	2.23	Between Groups Within Groups Total	63.58 1732.74 1796.32	4 391 395	15.90 4.43	3.587	0.007
	Primary School	94	9.70	2.05						
	Secondary	79	9.18	2.19						
	School	109	9.98	2.14						
	High School	99	10.33	2.03						
	University	396	9.83	2.13						
	Total									

According to the results of the Tukey Post-Hoc analysis performed at the end of the variance analysis to determine whether there were significant differences among the groups, there were significant differences found in the arithmetic averages of Ability and Education Quality. The results have shown that regarding Academic Self-Efficacy characteristic, there was a significant difference found among the students whose mothers were university graduate ($\bar{x}$ =61.53), elementary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =57.05) and secondary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =57.09) in favor of those whose mothers were university graduate; in the Ability sub dimension, there was a significant difference found among the students whose mothers were elementary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =27.03), secondary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =27.27), and university graduate ($\bar{x}$ =31.53) in favor of those who were university graduate; in the Education Quality dimension, there was a significant difference between the students whose mothers were secondary school graduate, ($\bar{x}$ =9.18) and those whose mothers were university graduate ($\bar{x}$ =10.33) in favor of those whose mothers were university graduate (see Table 6)

Moreover, according to the variance analysis results there was a significant difference found with respect to father's educational level in terms of father's educational level, Feeling of Insufficiency at School sub-dimension of the School Burnout Scale ($F=5.137$; $p<.05$), Academic Self-efficacy Scale total scores ($F=5.813$; $p<.05$) and its sub-dimension Ability ($F=8.127$; $p<.05$) and frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale ($F=4.017$; $p<.05$) (see Table 7).

Table 7. Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Father's Educational Level Variable

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Sub dimensions	Group	N	$\bar{x}$	SD		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	P
Feeling of Insufficiency at School	No education				Between Groups Within Groups Total	187.49 3567.75 3755.24	4 391 395	46.87 9.12	5.137	0.000
	Primary	2	9.00	1.41						
	School	80	9.93	2.61						
	Secondary	90	10.14	3.14						
	School	118	11.01	2.99						
	High School	106	11.65	3.24						
	University	396	10.76	3.08						
Total										
Academic Self-efficacy	No education				Between Groups Within Groups Total	2018.32 33940.68 35959.00	4 391 395	504.58 86.80	5.813	0.000
	Primary	2	54.00	0.00						
	School	80	56.79	9.94						
	Secondary	90	57.41	8.80						
	School	118	59.52	8.73						
	High School	106	62.57	9.92						
	University	396	59.28	9.54						
Total										
Ability	No education				Between Groups Within Groups Total	1891,16 22746,26 24637,42	4 391 395	472,79 58,17	8,127	0.000
	Primary	2	25,00	1,41						
	School	80	27,24	8,30						
	Secondary	90	27,34	7,04						
	School	118	28,54	6,88						
	High School	106	32,56	8,37						
	University	396	29,06	7,90						
Total										

Frequency of perception	No education									
	Primary	2	201.00	79.20	Between Groups					
	School	80	225.90	54.84		61615.64	4			
	Secondary	90	237.61	60.72		1499184.02	391	15403.91		
	School	118	257.55	63.41		1560799.66	395	3834.23	4.017	0.003
	High School	106	251.92	65.96						
	University	396	244.83	62.86	Total					
	Total									

According to the Post Hoc analysis results, there was a significant difference found with respect to father's education status variable. There was a significant difference found in the School Burnout Scale sub dimension Feeling of Insufficiency at School among the students whose fathers were university graduate ($\bar{x}$ =11.65) (elementary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =9.93) and secondary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =10.14) in favor of those whose fathers were university graduate; In relation to the Academic Self-efficacy feature, there was a significant difference found among the students whose fathers were university graduate ($\bar{x}$ =62.57), elementary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =56.79) and secondary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =57.05) in favor of those whose fathers were university graduate; in the Ability sub dimension, there was a significant difference found among the students whose fathers were university graduate ($\bar{x}$ =32.56) and those whose fathers were elementary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =27.24) and secondary school graduate ($\bar{x}$ =27.34) in favor of those whose fathers were university graduate (see Table 7).

According to the results of the analysis of variance, there was a significant difference in the relevant scale scores with respect to the level of employment of parents. According to the employment level of the mother, there was significant differences, School Burnout Scale sub-dimension Feeling of Insufficiency at School ($F=3.074$; $p<.05$) (see Table 8). Moreover, according to father's employment status, the analysis results have revealed that there were significant differences found in School Burnout Scale sub dimensions Need to rest time for fun ($F=2.740$; $p<.05$), Academic Self-Efficacy ($F=7.653$; $p<.05$) and its sub dimensions Context ($F=2.968$; $p<.05$), Education Quality ($F=7.125$; $p<.05$) and frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale ($F=3.460$; $p<.05$) (see Table 9).

Table 8. Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Mother's Employment Status Variable

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Subdimensions	Group	N	$\bar{x}$	SD		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	p
Feeling of insufficiency at school	Works full-time	113	10.92	3.30	Between					
	Works part-time	38	9.92	2.98	Groups	86.31	3	28.77		
	Retired	12	12.92	3.42	Within	3668.93	392	9.36	3.074	0.028
	Housewife	233	10.70	2.93	Groups	3755.24	395			
	Total	396	10.76	3.08	Total					

Table 9. Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Father's Employment Status Variable

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Subdimensions	Group	N	$\bar{x}$	SD		Sum of squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Need to rest time for fun	Full-time Job	299	11.17	3.04	Between					
	Part-time job	55	11.15	2.64	Groups	75.43	392			
	Retired	26	12.46	2.89	Within	3596.60	395	9.17	2.740	0.43
	Unemployed	16	9.75	4.02	Groups	3672.03				
	Total	396	11.19	3.05	Total					
Academic self-efficacy	Full-time Job	299	59.84	9.30	Between					
	Part-time job	55	56.89	8.42	Groups	1989.64	3			
	Retired	26	63.12	10.81	Within	33969.36	392	663.21	7.653	0.000
	Unemployed	16	50.63	9.84	Groups	35959.00	395	86.66		
	Total	396	59.28	9.54	Total					
Context	Full-time Job	299	20.73	5.14	Between					
	Part-time job	55	19.20	5.61	Groups	248.26	3			
	Retired	26	20.69	6.22	Within	10931.40	392	82.75	2.968	0.032
	Unemployed	16	17.50	5.13	Groups	11179.66	395	27.89		
	Total	396	20.38	5.32	Total					
Education quality	Full-time Job	299	9.91	2.00	Between					
	Part-time job	55	9.20	2.48	Groups	92.89	3			
	Retired	26	11.04	1.46	Within	1703.44	392	30.96	7.125	0.000
	Unemployed	16	8.44	2.83	Groups	1796.32	395	4.35		
	Total	396	9.83	2.13	Total					

According to the pos hoc analysis performed based on the results of the variance analysis in terms of mother's employment status, as, a significant difference was found between the students whose mothers were retired ($\bar{x}$ =12.92) and those whose mothers worked half day ($\bar{x}$ =9.92) in favor of those whose mothers were retired in School Burnout Scale, sub-dimension Feeling of Insufficiency at School. According to father's employment status, there was significant difference found between the students whose fathers were retired ($\bar{x}$ =12.46) and those whose fathers were unemployed/not working ($\bar{x}$ =9.75) in favor of those whose fathers were retired in School Burnout Scale subdimension Need to Rest and Time for Fun. According to the post hoc analysis performed based on the result of the variance analysis in terms of father's working level, no significant results were found in the Scheffe and Tukey analyzes in the context sub dimension whereas significant results were found in the LSD analysis. The results of the analysis, in terms of father's employment status, significant difference was found in terms of Academic Self-Efficacy Scale total score between the students whose fathers worked full day ($\bar{x}$ =59.84) and those whose fathers were unemployed/not working ($\bar{x}$ =50.63) in favor of those whose fathers worked full day; significant difference was found among the students whose fathers full day ($\bar{x}$ =63.12), those whose fathers worked half day ($\bar{x}$ =56.89) and those whose fathers were unemployed/not working ($\bar{x}$ =50.63) in favor of those retired; according to the context sub dimension among the students whose fathers work full day ($\bar{x}$ =20.73), those whose fathers work half day ($\bar{x}$ =19.20) and those whose fathers are unemployed/not working ($\bar{x}$ =17.50), in favor of those whose fathers work full day; according to frequency of perception of Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale, there was a significant difference among the students

whose fathers worked full day ($\bar{x}$ =248.97), those whose fathers worked half day ($\bar{x}$ =226.40) and those whose fathers were unemployed/not working ($\bar{x}$ =215.19) in favor of those working full day; and a significant difference was found between the students whose fathers were retired ($\bar{x}$ =254.42) and those whose fathers were unemployed ($\bar{x}$ =215.19) in favor of those whose fathers were retired) (see Table 8 and Table 9).

The results of analysis of variance according to the variable of interest in doing homework during spare time, showed significant differences in sub-dimensions of School Burnout Scale total ($F=7.058$; $p<.05$) and Loss of interest to school ($F=4.532$; $p<.05$), Burnout from Studying ($F=12.375$; $p<.05$), Burnout from homework ($F=7.701$; $p<.05$). Academic Self-Efficacy Scale total score ($F=13.653$; $p<.05$) and its sub dimension ability ($F=11.749$; $p<.05$), Context ($F=5.694$; $p<.05$) and Education Quality ($F=3.533$; $p<.05$) and Child and frequency of perception Adolescence Social Support Scale ($F= 9.592$; $p<.05$) showed significant differences (see Table 10).

Table 10: Variance Analysis Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to the interest in Doing Homework During Spare Time

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Subdimensions	Group	N	$\bar{x}$	SD		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	P
Burnout School	Always	72	98.68	23.19	Between Groups Within Groups Total	10266.96 142188.02 152454.98	4 391 395	2566.74 363.65	7.058	0.000
	Usually	139	97.34	19.28						
	Sometimes	126	91.28	16.89						
	Rarely	44	85.25	15.61						
	Never	15	80.13	21.69						
	Total	396	93.66	19.65						
Loss of interest to school	Always	72	18.06	5.12	Between Groups Within Groups Total	379.39 8182.50 8561.89	4 391 395	94.85 20.93	4.532	0.001
	Usually	139	18.09	4.66						
	Sometimes	126	17.06	4.03						
	Rarely	44	16.32	4.50						
	Never	15	13.60	5.59						
	Total	396	17.39	4.66						
Burnout from studying	Always	72	17.85	4.77	Between Groups Within Groups Total	793.40 6267.03 7060.43	4 391 395	198.35 16.03	12.375	0.000
	Usually	139	16.99	3.74						
	Sometimes	126	15.45	3.35						
	Rarely	44	13.43	4.03						
	Never	15	13.53	6.70						
	Total	396	16.13	4.23						
Burnout from homework	Always	72	15.03	3.79	Between Groups Within Groups Total	359.44 4562.59 4922.03	4 391 395	89.86 11.67	7.701	0.000
	Usually	139	14.94	3.39						
	Sometimes	126	13.75	3.10						
	Rarely	44	12.57	2.68						
	Never	15	11.73	5.62						
	Total	396	14.19	3.53						
Academic Self-Efficacy	Always	72	62.82	9.93	Between Groups Within Groups Total	4406.86 31552.14 35959.00	4 391 395	1101.71 80.70	13.653	0.000
	Usually	139	61.81	8.80						
	Sometimes	126	57.20	8.72						
	Rarely	44	52.98	7.92						
	Never	15	54.67	10.83						
	Total	396	59.28	9.54						
Ability	Always	72	32.31	8.22	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2643.45 21993.97 24637.42	4 391 395	660.86 56.25	11.749	0.000
	Usually	139	30.68	7.36						
	Sometimes	126	26.86	7.00						
	Rarely	44	24.57	6.81						

	Never	15	30.20	10.68	Total					
	Total	396	29.06	7.90						
Context	Always	72	20.21	6.25	Between Groups Within Groups Total	615.42 10564.24 11179.66	4 391 395	153.85 27.02	5.694	0.000
	Usually	139	21.06	5.23						
	Sometimes	126	20.76	4.60						
	Rarely	44	19.41	4.81						
	Never	15	14.67	5.16						
	Total	396	20.38	5.32						
Education quality	Always	72	10.31	2.27	Between Groups Within Groups Total	62.66 1733.66 1796.32	4 391 395	15.66 4.43	3.533	0.008
	Usually	139	10.07	1.96						
	Sometimes	126	9.58	1.97						
	Rarely	44	9.00	2.41						
	Never	15	9.80	2.73						
	Total	396	9.83	2.13						
Frequency of perception	Always	72	258.17	63.22	Between Groups Within Groups Total	139477.92 1421321.75 1560799.66	4 391 395	34869.48 3635.09	9.592	0.000
	Usually	139	256.09	58.87						
	Sometimes	126	233.46	58.56						
	Rarely	44	246.77	60.59						
	Never	15	166.27	72.07						
	Total	396	244.83	62.86						

According to the variable of doing homework in leisure time, there was a significant difference found among the students who stated always ($\bar{x}$ =98.68), those who stated rarely ($\bar{x}$ =85.25) and never ($\bar{x}$ =80.13) in favor of those who stated always. In Loss of Interest to School, a significant difference found between the students who said never ($\bar{x}$ =13.60) and those who said usually ($\bar{x}$ =18.09), in favor of the latter one; between the students who said never ($\bar{x}$ =13.60) and those who said always ($\bar{x}$ =18.06) in favor of the latter one. In the dimension of Burnout from studying, there was a significant difference found among the students who said always ($\bar{x}$ =17.85), never ($\bar{x}$ =13.53), sometimes ($\bar{x}$ =15.45) and rarely ($\bar{x}$ =13.43), in favor of those who said always; between those who said never ($\bar{x}$ =13.53) and always ($\bar{x}$ =17.85) in favor of the latter one. In the dimension of Burnout from homework, there was a significant difference found between the students who said always ($\bar{x}$ =15.03), rarely ($\bar{x}$ =12.57) never ($\bar{x}$ =11.73) in favor of those who said always. In the dimension of Academic Self-Efficacy, there was a significant difference found between the students who said always ($\bar{x}$ =62.82), sometimes ($\bar{x}$ =57.20), rarely ($\bar{x}$ =52.98) and never ($\bar{x}$ =54.67) in favor of those who said always. In the Ability sub dimension, there was a significant difference found among the students who said always ($\bar{x}$ =32.31), sometimes ($\bar{x}$ =26.82) and rarely ($\bar{x}$ =24.57) in favor of those who said always; in the context dimension, there was a significant difference found among the students who said never ($\bar{x}$ =14.67), always ($\bar{x}$ =20.21), usually ($\bar{x}$ =21.06) and sometimes ($\bar{x}$ =20.76) in favor of those who said never. In the dimension of Education Quality, there was a significant difference found between the students who said always ($\bar{x}$ =10.31), and those who said rarely ($\bar{x}$ =9.00) in favor of the latter one. According to the frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale, there was a significant difference found among the students who said never ($\bar{x}$ =166.27), always ($\bar{x}$ =258.17), usually ($\bar{x}$ =256.09), sometimes ($\bar{x}$ =233.46), rarely ($\bar{x}$ =246.77) against those who said never (see Table 10).

When table 11 is examined, according to the results of variance analysis whether the study group has significant difference in terms of the relevant characteristics according to the variable of participating in any

activity (family participation in an activity together in the duration of a week) with the family, there was a significant difference found in the sub-dimension of Burnout from family ($F=5.708$; $p<.05$) of School Burnout Scale, Academic Self-Efficacy Scale total score ($F=11.352$; $p<.05$) and one of the sub-dimensions Ability ($F=9.318$; $p<.05$), Restrictive Monitoring ($F=3.078$; $p<.05$) sub-dimensions of the Parental Monitoring scale, and frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Support Scale ($F=7.363$; $p<.05$).

Table 11. Variance Analysis results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics according to the Variable of Participation in Any Kinds of Activities with the Family (Family Participation In An Activity Together In The Duration Of A Week)

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Subdimensions	Group	<i>N</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	<i>P</i>
Burnout from Family	Never	26	11.65	4.04	Between Groups Within Groups Total	354.40 6069.60 6424.00	4 391 395	88.60 15.52	5.708	0.000
	1-2 hours a week	85	12.29	3.92						
	3-5 hours a week	125	13.18	3.79						
	6-7 hours a week	87	14.76	3.76						
	8 hours, more a week	73	13.70	4.37						
	Total	396	13.33	4.03						
Restrictive monitoring	Never	26	5.27	2.97	Between Groups Within Groups Total	46.47 1476.07 1522.55	4 391 395	11.62 3.78	3.078	0.016
	1-2 hours a week	85	4.00	1.76						
	3-5 hours a week	125	4.12	2.15						
	6-7 hours a week	87	3.91	1.72						
	8 hours, more a week	73	3.78	1.53						
	Total	396	4.06	1.96						
Academic Self-Efficacy	Never	26	52.04	11.38	Between Groups Within Groups Total	3741.66 32217.34 35959.00	4 391 395	935.41 82.40	11.352	0.000
	1-2 hours a week	85	56.16	8.29						
	3-5 hours a week	125	59.03	9.40						
	6-7 hours a week	87	61.60	8.09						
	8 hours, more a week	73	63.12	9.59						
	Total	396	59.28	9.54						
Ability	Never	26	24.54	9.18	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2144.17 22493.25 24637.42	4 391 395	536.04 57.53	9.318	0.000
	1-2 hours a week	85	26.73	7.76						
	3-5 hours a week	125	28.50	7.61						
	6-7 hours a week	87	30.51	6.60						
	8 hours, more a week	73	32.63	7.81						
	Total	396	29.06	7.90						
Frequency of perception	Never	26	191.00	58.71	Between Groups Within Groups Total	109331.66 1451468.00 1560799.66	4 391 395	27332.92 3712.19	7.363	0.000
	1-2 hours a week	85	234.64	59.83						
	3-5 hours a week	125	247.13	60.41						
	6-7 hours a week	87	257.48	59.53						
	8 hours, more a week	73	256.86	65.33						
	Total	396	244.83	62.86						

According to the results of the Tukey Post-Hoc analysis performed after the variance analysis to determine whether there were significant differences between the duration of participating in an activity with the family (in a one-week period), there was a significant difference found in the School Burnout Scale sub dimension

Burnout from family, among those who said 6-7 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =14.76) and never ($\bar{x}$ =11.65) and 1-2 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =12.29) in favor of those who said 6-7 hours a week. In the Parental Monitoring sub dimension Restrictive Monitoring, there was a difference found among the students who said never ($\bar{x}$ =5.27) and those who said 6-7 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =3.91) and more than 8 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =3.78) in favor of those whos said never; According to the Academic Self Efficacy total score, there was a significant difference among those who said 6-7 hours a week($\bar{x}$ =61.60), never ($\bar{x}$ =52.04) and 1-2 hours ($\bar{x}$ =56.16) in favor of those who said 6-7 hours a week; In the Ability sub dimension, there was a significant difference among the students who said 6-7 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =30.51), never ($\bar{x}$ =24.54) and 1-2 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =26.73) in favor of those who said 6-7 hours a week. In the frequency of perception of Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale, there was a significant difference found among the students who said never ($\bar{x}$ =191,00) and 1-2 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =234,64), 3-5 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =247,13), 6-7 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =257,48), more than 8 hours a week ($\bar{x}$ =256,86) against those who said never (see Table 11).

According to the frequency of participation in school educational activities, there was a significant difference found in the Indirect Monitoring ($F=4.951$; $p<.05$) subdimension of parental monitoring and ability ($F=5.969$; $p<.05$) sub dimension of Academic Self-Efficacy Scale. After the post hoc analysis, in the Indirect Monitoring scores according to the participation of school educational activities variable, there was a significant difference found between the students who said always($\bar{x}$ =15.16), and never ($\bar{x}$ =12.21), in favor of those who said always. In the dimension of Academic Self-Efficacy, there was a significant difference found between the students who said always ($\bar{x}$ =33.39) and never ($\bar{x}$ =27.67) in favor of those who said always (see Table 12).

Table 12. The Results of Variance Analysis of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Frequency of Participation in School Educational Activities

F. and SD Values					Results of ANOVA					
Scales/Subdimensions	Group	<i>N</i>	$\bar{x}$	<i>SD</i>		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	<i>P</i>
Indirect monitoring	Always	31	15.16	4.53	Between Groups Within Groups Total	347.19 6855.38 7202.57	4 391 395	86.80 17.53	4.951	0.001
	Usually	29	13.52	4.73						
	Sometimes	56	13.29	4.24						
	Rarely	51	14.00	4.38						
	Never	229	12.21	4.01						
	Total	396	12.92	4.27						
Ability	Always	31	33.39	7.20	Between Groups Within Groups Total	1417.99 23219.43 24637.42	4 391 395	354.50 59.38	5.969	0.000
	Usually	29	31.28	7.00						
	Sometimes	56	31.18	7.92						
	Rarely	51	29.12	7.27						
	Never	229	27.67	7.89						
	Total	396	29.06	7.90						

As can be seen in Table 13, there was a significant difference found in terms of related characteristics as a result of the t-test conducted to examine whether the students of the sample group differed in school burnout, academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring and social support according to families' support in students'

participation in school activities. There was a significant difference in favor of the students indicating that their participation in school events was supported by their families in School Burnout Scale total scores ($t(394) = 2.292$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 95.69$ No $\bar{x} = 91.17$) and its sub dimensions Loss of Interest to School ($t(394) = 3.494$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 18.11$ No $\bar{x} = 16.49$), Burnout from studying ($t(394) = 2.695$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 16.64$ No $\bar{x} = 15.50$) and Burnout from homework ($t(394) = 2.730$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 14.63$ No $\bar{x} = 13.66$). There was a significant difference in favor of the students indicating that their participation in school events was supported by their families in Indirect Monitoring total scores ($t(394) = 2.793$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 13.46$ No $\bar{x} = 12.26$) and the averages of its sub dimensions Computer Monitoring ($t(393.40) = 2.690$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 7.09$ No $\bar{x} = 6.35$) and phone Monitoring ($t(391.62) = 2.803$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 3.17$ No $\bar{x} = 2.77$) and Academic Self-Efficacy total score averages ($t(394) = 3.589$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 60.81$ No $\bar{x} = 57.40$) and Ability ($t(394) = 3.332$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 30.24$ No $\bar{x} = 27.62$), and Education Quality ($t(340.96) = 2.356$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 10.06$ No $\bar{x} = 9.54$). A significant difference was found in favor of the students indicating that their participation in school events was supported by their families in Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale's sub dimensions related to frequency of perception ($t(394) = 3.556$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 254.83$ No $\bar{x} = 232.58$) and importance ($t(394) = 2.346$; $p < .05$; Yes $\bar{x} = 150.49$ No $\bar{x} = 144.76$).

Table 13. t test Results of School Burnout, Academic Self-Efficacy, Parental Monitoring and Social Support Characteristics According to Family's Supporting Participation in School Activities Variable

Scales/Subdimensions	Groups	N	$\bar{x}$	t test			
				SD	t	df	P
Burnout school	Yes	218	95.69	19.56	2.292	394	.022
	No	178	91.17	19.51			
Loss of interest to school	Yes	218	18.11	4.64	3.494	394	.001
	No	178	16.49	4.53			
Burnout from studying	Yes	218	16.64	4.22	2.695	394	.007
	No	178	15.50	4.17			
Burnout from homework	Yes	218	14.63	3.55	2.730	394	.007
	No	178	13.66	3.44			
Indirect monitoring	Yes	218	13.46	4.41	2.793	394	.005
	No	178	12.26	4.01			
Computer monitoring	Yes	218	7.09	3.08	2.690	393.40	.007
	No	178	6.35	2.42			
Phone monitoring	Yes	218	3.17	1.64	2.803	391.62	.005
	No	178	2.77	1.23			
Academic self-efficacy	Yes	218	60.81	9.07	3.589	394	.000
	No	178	57.40	9.79			
Ability	Yes	218	30.24	7.49	3.332	394	.001
	No	178	27.62	8.16			
Education Quality	Yes	218	10.06	1.92	2.356	340.96	.019
	No	178	9.54	2.34			
Frequency of perception	Yes	218	254.83	61.51	3.556	394	.000
	No	178	232.58	62.49			
Importance	Yes	218	150.49	23.67	2.346	394	.019
	No	178	144.76	24.80			

Results of the Pearson correlation indicated that there were a significant positive association between Burnout School and Academic Self-Efficacy, ($r(396) = .44$, $p = .000$), between Burnout School and sub dimensions of

Child and Adolescent Social Support Frequency of perception, ($r(396) = .32, p = .000$), and between Burnout School and importance, ($r(396) = .34, p = .000$). There were a significant positive association between Academic Self-Efficacy and Frequency of perception ($r(396) = .32, p = .000$), and between Academic Self-Efficacy and importance ($r(396) = .24, p = .000$) (see Table 14).

Table 14. According to the Results of the Correlation Analysis of School Burnout Scale, Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, Parental Monitoring Scale, Child and Adolescent Social Support

		Burnout School	Parental Monitoring	Academic Self-Efficacy	Child and Adolescent Social Support	
					Frequency of perception	Importance
Burnout School	Pearson Cor.	1	,054	.445**	.326**	.344**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		,280	,000	,000	,000
	N	396	396	396	396	396
Parental Monitoring	Pearson Cor.	,054	1	,068	,022	,049
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,280		,174	,665	,327
	N	396	396	396	396	396
Academic Self-Efficacy	Pearson Cor.	.445**	,068	1	.321**	.245**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,174		,000	,000
	N	396	396	396	396	396
Frequency of perception	Pearson Cor.	.326**	,022	.321**	1	.520**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,665	,000		,000
	N	396	396	396	396	396
Importance	Pearson Cor.	.344**	,049	.245**	.520**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,327	,000	,000	
	N	396	396	396	396	396

DISCUSSION

In the study conducted with the aim of examining whether there is a relationship between secondary school students burnout and academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring, social support and leisure time, the results of the study have shown that there were significant differences found with respect to relevant characteristics, demographic features, variables and leisure time activities.

When the results obtained are considered, the average score of girls was found to be higher than the average score of boys in School Burnout Scale total score averages according to gender variable and its sub dimensions Burnout from family and Burnout from homework sub dimensions. This indicates concerns of girls regarding their inadequacy in the education environment with the influence of the attitudes of their parents in relation to their educational life. In addition, according to the gender variable, the average scores of female students were found to be higher than the average scores of male students in the Direct Monitoring score average the sub dimensions of Parental Monitoring Scale, and Academic Self-Efficacy Scale total score averages and its sub dimension of context score averages. Results have revealed that female students continuously feel the control

of their parents, the success in educational life is important for them and they also perceive their academic self-efficacy and learning environment more positively than male students. Although the results seems to be contradictory in relation to school burnout, it indicates the value of academic success and school environment in family and social life. This situation makes us think that the needs of female students to "prove themselves and be appreciated" leads them to feel their families' comments, evaluations, or anticipations regarding academic performance more intensely than males so this may increase the level of anxiety regarding their school duties. The result that male students have higher average scores for the following subscales than female students; the sub dimension of Parental Monitoring Scale, School Monitoring Health Monitoring, Computer Monitoring and Restrictive Monitoring draws attention to the fact that the role and task descriptions of the families for the "male" and "female" may cause difference in their child-rearing attitudes. Obtained results support other research results related to school burnout according to gender (Salmela-Aro & Tynkkynen, 2012; Çapulcuoğlu & Gündüz,2014).

In line with the results obtained according to the age variable, there was a significant difference found with respect to School Burnout Scale of the groups and one of its sub dimensions Loss of Interest to School Burnout from Studying, Burnout from Family, Burnout from Homework sub dimensions. The results obtained according to age variable presented that 12-year old students have difficulties in adapting to the teaching environment with their secondary school curriculum. It has also shown that differences between the relationship of students at 13 years of age and their parents occur with the developmental dynamics of the puberty period. Although students experience social support more intensely at the age of 13, the fact that they may have developmental difficulties and communication problems along with developmental differences is consistent with the information that they get into contact with their peers more than they do with their family members.

The results in terms of grade variable, School Burnout Scale total scores and its sub-dimensions Burnout from studying, Burnout from homework, Feeling of Insufficiency at School and Burnout from teacher attitudes were higher in the 6th grade compared to the 8th grade student. Furthermore, it has been seen that the Loss of Interest to School differentiated from the 8th grade students in favor of the 6th and 7th grade students. The results obtained according to the grade variable were in parallel with the findings in terms of age variable. According to the findings, it can be stated that it is necessary to consider dynamics in relation to level of students' readiness for post-primary education. Relevant studies suggest that school burnout is higher in the 7th and 8th-grade students. The results of this study have revealed that the process of school burnout starts in the 6th grade and continues at the 7th grade. Moreover, the results of the relevant studies regarding lack of interest on school have revealed that the burnout increases parallel to the lack of interest towards school (Öztan, 2014; Özdemir 2015).

According to the results obtained in relation to the academic achievement variable, the average scores were found to be higher in the School Burnout Level between the students who stated their achievement level as "good" and "very good" in the dimensions of Burnout from family, Boredom, Feeling of Insufficiency at school,

burn out from studying, need to rest and sub dimensions of parental monitoring scale as direct monitoring and restrictive monitoring. Moreover, there was a difference regarding students stating their level of achievement as "very good" in Academic Self-Efficacy Scale and its sub dimensions Ability and Education Quality and the frequency of perception in Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale. When the findings were evaluated in the context of parental monitoring and child and adolescent social support, they revealed parallelism with the literature related to school exhaustion and academic self-efficacy. In addition, findings related to parental monitoring and child and adolescent social support in accordance with the achievement levels of the students draw attention to the fact that although successful students are supported by their parents, the support may also have opposite effects. This situation highlights a vicious circle where on one hand there are students with high academic self-confidence, having positive self-sufficiency definitions, and the ability to benefit from the characteristics of the educational environment, on the other hand, there are successful students who question the definitions of their own qualifications, are tired of working, putting effort and willing to give up (Salmelo-Aro, Savolainen & Holopainen, 2009). In other words, it is possible to state that the success criteria of the family and the social circle for the teaching process are compelling and concerning for young people in the first period of adolescence. Moreover, studies on academic self-efficacy have revealed that there is a positive relation between achievement scores and academic self-efficacy. The obtained results support the findings of the relevant literature (Brown, 2004; Schunk & Meece, 2005; Urdan & Schoenfelder, 2006; Öncü, 2012)

As a result of variance analysis about whether the students of the study group differed in terms of the relevant characteristics according to results of the mother's education level variable, there was a difference found in Academic Self-Efficacy Scale and its sub-dimensions Ability and Education Quality. According to Father's Education status variable, there was a significant difference found in the School Burnout Scale sub dimension Feeling of Insufficiency at School among the students whose fathers were university, graduate elementary school graduate and secondary school graduate in favor of those whose fathers were university graduate; In relation to the Academic Self-efficacy feature, in the Ability sub dimension. In the direction of the findings, it is possible to express that maternal education level is one of the factors that can positively affect students' perception of academic self-efficacy in other words perception of efficacy in order to fulfill a job. In addition, the finding obtained according to the variable of mother's education level is parallel to the studies of the related fields which reveal the importance of mother as "an individual" in human life as well as the findings of many interdisciplinary studies. According to the education level variable of the father, it is in favor of students whose father is a university graduate; the difference in the sub dimension of Feeling of Insufficiency at School scores out that the education level of their fathers can cause students to perceive their own performances regarding school duties and responsibilities as insufficient. It has been emphasized that the students whose fathers are university graduate have positive attitudes in terms of their self-efficacy as it is the case for the students whose mothers are university graduate. Although both findings of school burnout and academic self-sufficiency seem to contradict each other, it reveals the importance of father's education level in the student's success in education life. The result obtained highlights the significance of parents as role models in the formation of life definitions (Anderson, Betz, 2001; Collins, Brett, 2004; Özyıldırım, 2014).

According to the findings obtained, as a result of variance analysis about whether the students of the study group differed in terms of school burnout, academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring and child and adolescent social support according to parents' employment status, a significant difference was found in the followings; School Burnout Scale sub dimensions, Academic Self-Efficacy and frequency of perception of Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale. Depending on the mother's employment status, the result obtained in favor of retirees in the sub-dimension of Feeling of Insufficiency at School draws attention to the adaptation process to the retirement period of the mother after working life and the effect of this process especially on children in the family. Findings related to the employment status of the father emphasize that the father's retirement can make a difference in the parent-child relationship as well as the father's having a regular job. Results according to the employment status of the parents can be supported with psychological theories and studies drawing attention to the significance of parents as a role model and the relevant literature emphasizing on labor economics and mental health (Kurt, 2006; Sümer, Solak &Harma,2013).

The results obtained have revealed that according to the variables of doing homework in leisure time, there was a significant difference found Loss of Interest to School, Burnout from studying, Burnout from homework, Academic Self-Efficacy and Ability In the dimension of Education Quality frequency of perception Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale. The differentiation that is in favor of the students who indicate that they are "always" interested in assignments draws attention to the need to consider the positive effects of the situation in terms of academic self-efficacy and its negative effects in terms of school burnout. In other words, it can be noted that there is also a need for students to socialize, rest and enjoy within the context of developmental period. Placing the educational activities at the center of their lives without fulfilling those needs can have an opposite effect in terms of expectations. In addition, the students who stated that they were not "interested" at all with their homework in their spare time in terms of the result related to frequency of perception of Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale makes us think which one would be effective in this process: "Doing homework" or "Being able to get support in order to be able to do Homework".

When the duration of participating in an activity with the family (in a one-week period) was considered, there was a significant difference found in the School Burnout Scale sub dimension Burnout from family, in the Parental Monitoring sub dimension Restrictive Monitoring, in the Academic Self Efficacy total score, in the frequency of perception of Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale. In line with these results, in the School Burnout Scale sub dimension Burnout from family, Parental Monitoring Scale Restrictive Monitoring sub-dimension and Academic Self Efficacy and the sub dimension of Ability from the ability sub dimensions, there was a difference in favor of the students who participate in any activity/events together with the family more than 6-7 hours a week according to the variable of participating in an activity together with the family. In the Child and Adolescent Social Support Scale Frequency of Support dimension, there was a difference found against the students who said "never" to the participation of any activity with their families. The result obtained was parallel with other findings of the study in relation to the School Burnout Scale, Academic Self-Efficacy Scale, Parental Monitoring and Child and Adolescent Social Support Scales. Therefore, it is highly

recommended that the problem of "quantity and quality" in the interaction of the families with their children should be examined. When the characteristics of adolescence are taken into account, it is necessary to consider whether the interaction of parents for supporting their children is fulfilling the psychological needs of the child. it is to be considered that although the family effort only to support educational activities or intellectual development of adolescent students may be meaningful for the child, it could be emotionally compelling and incomplete. In the Indirect Monitoring scores according to the participation of school educational activities variable, there was a significant difference found between the students who said always, and never, in favor of those who said always. In the dimension of Academic Self-Efficacy, there was a significant difference found between the students who said always and never in favor of those who said always. Educational activities at schools are activities organized to support the emotional and social development of students along with teaching activities. In the Regulation of the Ministry of Education Educational Institutions Social Activities, entered into force by being published in the Official Gazette, dated 06/08/2017 and numbered 30090 ¹ Republic of Turkey the Ministry of Education makes the following statement "The aim of this Regulation is; to organize the procedures and principles of social activities within the scope of students clubs and community service in scientific, social, cultural, artistic and sports fields for developing self-confidence and sense of responsibility in students and trainees in addition to teaching programs, creating new areas of interest and bringing national, spiritual, moral, human and cultural values in official and private formal and informal educational institutions in all kinds and levels." Therefore, according to the variable of participation in the school educational club activities of the study, the finding of the Academic Self-Efficacy Scale shows that the Ministry of National Education is able to reach its developmental goals through educational institutions. The finding of the Parental Monitoring Scale supports the literature regarding the regulation which constitutes the basis to encourage the contribution and participation of all stakeholders of education.

Moreover, the results have also revealed that there was a significant difference found in terms of related characteristics as a result of the t-test conducted to examine whether the students who constituted the sample group in school burnout, academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring and social support according to families' support in students' participation in school activities. The findings of school burnout of students whose participation in school activities were supported by their families provide information regarding the fact that the meaning of school activities is interpreted differently by the stakeholders conducting teaching activities and their families or that the way of their application could result adversely. Moreover, it has been suggested that

¹ Ministry of National Education Regulation on Social Activities of Elementary and Secondary Education Institutions published in the Official Gazette dated 01/13/2005 and numbered 25699 and The Social and Cultural Competition Regulation of the Ministry of National Education published in the Official Gazette dated 12/26/1995 and numbered 22505 were abolished. and the Social Activities Regulation of the Ministry of National Education Institutions has been entered into force by being published in Official Gazette dated 06/08/2017 and numbered 30090.

the implementation of "incentives and rewards" should be re-conceptualized in terms of all stakeholders of education in the Regulation on Social Activities of Educational Institutions of the Ministry of National Education both for school administrators and teachers to carry out such activities and for families to encourage their children's participation.

The correlation analysis results of the data regarding the scales of the students of the study group have revealed that there was a positive but moderate relationship between School Burnout, Academic Self-efficacy, and Social Support. The obtained result was in consistency with the results of other analyzes of the study group, suggesting that school burnout may increase with academic self-efficacy perceptions and social support. This can be supported by research results on perfectionism and student burnout, as well as research results on the effects of parents, teacher, and peer groups' expectations on students. Furthermore, considering that problems of adaptation due to changes in physical appearance in the first phase of adolescence namely puberty are accompanied by problems of being accepted, being valuable and being appreciated in young people, academic success and academic ability can have the role of a compensation mechanism. Therefore, students may need to study harder to ensure the continuity of their academic self-efficacy and require the appreciation and reward they believe they can achieve with high performance; this can lead to anxiety, fatigue, exhaustion, frustration and loss of interest to school, meaning school burn-out.

RESULT

The aim of the study was to examine the school burnout of secondary school students in terms of academic self-efficacy, parental monitoring, social support and leisure activities. According to the findings obtained, significant differences were found in favor of female students in terms of gender variable in the School Burnout sub dimension Burnout from family; in Academic Self-Efficacy and one of its sub-dimensions context. There were differences found in favor of male students in Parental Monitoring Scale sub-dimensions of School, Health, Computer and Restrictive monitoring. According to the age variable; there was a significant difference in favor of 12-year old students between the burnout level of the students aged 12 years and the burnout level of the students aged 13 and 14 years in the School Burnout Scale and its sub dimensions Loss of Interest to School, Burnout from homework and Burnout from studying. It was found that the 13-year-old group differed from the other age group with respect to the parental monitoring scale. The findings obtained according to the class variable were in parallel with the findings obtained according to the age variable. There was a significant difference in favor of the 6th grade students in the School Burnout Scale and its sub dimensions Loss of Interest towards School, Burnout from Doing Homework and Feeling of Insufficiency at School, Burnout from Teacher Attitudes. While the findings obtained according to the academic achievement variable were in favor of the students who stated that they found themselves very successful in the school burnout levels and Burnout from family, Feeling of Insufficiency at School stemming from teacher attitudes, need to rest and time for fun dimensions, similar situation was observed in direct monitoring and restrictive monitoring subdimensions of the parental monitoring. It was found that the students who stated that their academic achievement was very

good showed a significant difference in ability and educational qualities sub-dimensions of academic self-efficacy. In terms of educational level variables of mother and father, there was a significant difference in favor of students whose parents were university graduates in the dimensions of academic self-efficacy, ability and educational quality of mother's education; in the school burnout sub dimensions of Feeling of Insufficiency at School and academic self-efficacy dimensions according to father's level of education.

According to the employment status of the parents, there was a significant difference found in the Feeling of Insufficiency at School sub dimension of School Burnout in favor of the students whose mothers were retired; according to father's employment status, there was a significant difference found in favor of those in the students whose fathers worked full time in the academic self-efficacy, school burnout sub dimensions Need to rest and time for fun. It was found that the students who stated that they were always interested in their homework in their leisure time differed in terms of school burnout and its sub-dimension's loss of interest towards school, burnout from studying, Burnout from homework; academic self-efficacy and its sub-dimensions of ability, environment and education quality and the frequency of child and adolescent social support. In the frequency of participation of any activity with the family (in one-week period), there was a difference found in Burnout from family, restrictive monitoring dimension of parental monitoring and academic self-efficacy and one of its sub-dimension's ability between the students who said they could spend 6-7 hours with their family and those who said that they spent less time with their family. The findings regarding whether parents' participation in the school's educational club activities made a difference indicated a significant difference in favor of the students who said that it made a difference in terms of school burnout and its sub dimensions, loss of interest towards school, burnout from studying, burnout from homework, parental monitoring and its sub-dimensions, computer and phone monitoring; academic self-efficacy and its sub dimensions ability and education quality; the child and adolescent social support frequency level and importance dimensions. Moreover, as a result of the correlation made to determine whether there is a relationship with the related characteristics, a positive relationship is found with the intermediate level among school burnout, academic self-efficacy and social support.

According to the results of the study, it is possible to state the followings: students who move to secondary school from elementary school may have difficulty in adapting to secondary school curriculum and school climate and culture; the fact that female and male students cannot be educated in the context of gender equality in terms of relevant characteristics may have different effects on both genders; the level of education of the parents and their working conditions may be important in terms of life expectancy and definitions as a role model for their children; although it is important for students to be supported by their families, involvement in school duties and participation in educational club activities in terms of academic and social development can also cause some difficulties; students pay for their positive behaviors by experiencing burnout.

SUGGESTIONS

In accordance with the results of the study, the following issues have been stated as significant: first of all, it is necessary to provide the required readiness of the elementary school students for the secondary education level; organization of orientation activities within the cooperation and coordination of school management, teachers and counselling services for all classes in the secondary school level not only for the students but also for the teachers who provide teaching services and families. It is required to realize "incentive and reward" practice designed to ensure the support of school administrators, teachers and parents for the participation of students in extracurricular activities in the Regulation on Social Activities of Educational Institutions of the Ministry of National Education and these activities need to be highlighted as activities far beyond ambition, competition and suppression, that will ensure cooperation, being planned and programmed and socializing of students. In addition, gender equality issues, one of the areas of sociology, psychology, economics and many other disciplines should be accelerated on a family basis. Furthermore, the importance of educating students without gender discrimination for a society composed of healthy men and women and all individuals forming the society to be productive with the education level of parents have been highly emphasized. As a conclusion, it is believed that the studies related to the subject should not be limited to the areas of psychology and educational psychology, it is essential to comprehend it with interdisciplinary studies for educating young people who are the basis of a healthy and developed society.

REFERENCES

- Aksu, A., & Baysal, A. (2005). "İlköğretim Okulu Müdürlerinde Tükenmişlik". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 11(1): 7-24.
- Anderson, S. L., & Betz, N. E. (2001). "Sources of Social Self-Efficacy Expectations: Their Measurement and Relation To Career Development". *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 58(1): 98-117.
- Aypay, A. (2012). "Secondary School Burnout Scale (SSBS)". *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(2): 782-787.
- Aypay, A. & Eryılmaz, A. (2011). "Lise Öğrencilerinin Öznel İyi Oluşları ve Okul Tükenmişliği Arasındaki İlişkiler". (Relationships of high school students' subjective well-being and school burnout). *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3(1): 181-199.
- Aypay, A., & Sever, M. (2015). "School As If A Workplace: Exploring Burnout Among High School Students/Bir İş Yeri Gibi Okul: Lise Öğrencileri Arasında Tükenmişliğin Keşfi". *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 11(2): 460-472.
- Bandura, A. (2005). "Adolescence Development From An Agentic Perspective". *Self Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescence*. (Eds.) Tim Urdan and Frank Pajares. USA: Information Age Publishing. 1-47.
- Başol, G., & Altay, M. (2009). "Eğitim Yöneticisi Ve Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Tükenmişlik Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 15(2): 191-216.

- Bask, M., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2013). "Burned Out To Drop Out: Exploring The Relationship Between School Burnout And School Dropout". *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 28(2): 511-528.
- Betoret, F. D. (2006). "Stressors, Self-Efficacy, Coping Resources, and Burnout Among Secondary School Teachers In Spain". *Educational Psychology*, 26(4): 519-539.
- Bong, M., & Skaalvik, E. M. (2003). "Academic Self-Concept And Self-Efficacy: How Different Are They Really?". *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(1): 1-40.
- Brown, B. (2004). "Adolescents' Relationships With Peers". *Handbook Of Adolescent Psychology (Eds.) Richard M. Lerner and Laurence Steinberg*. (Second Edition). New Jersey: John Wiley&Sons, Inc. 363-394.
- Cırık, İ., Oktay, A., & Fer, Seval. "Çocuk ve Ergenler İçin Sosyal Destek Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması". *Education Sciences*, 6(1): 939-957.
- Çağlar, Ç. (2011). "Okullardaki Örgütsel Güven Düzeyi İle Öğretmenlerin Mesleki Tükenmişlik Düzeyinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 11(4): 1827-1847.
- Collins, W. A. & Brett Lause. (2004). "Parent-Adolescent Relationships And Influences". *Handbook Of Adolescent Psychology. (Eds.) Richard M. Lerner and Laurence Steinberg*. (second edition). New Jersey: John Wiley&Sons, Inc. 331-361,
- Farber, B. A. (2000). "Treatment For Different Types Of Teacher Burnout". *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 56(5): 675-689.
- Friedman, I. A. (1991). "High And Low-Burnout Schools: School Culture Aspects of Teacher Burnout". *The Journal Of Educational Research*, 84(6): 325-333.
- Izgar, H. (2001). "Okul Yöneticilerinin Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri". *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 7(3): 335-346.
- Karataş, H., & Öztürk, C. (2011). "Anne-Baba İzleme Ölçeğinin Psikometrik Özellikleri". *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry/Anadolu Psikiyatri Dergisi*, 12(2): 151-157
- Kokkinos, C. M. (2007). "Job Stressors, Personality and Burnout In Primary School Teachers". *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(1): 229-243.
- Korhonen, J., Tapola, A., Linnanmäki, K., & Aunio, P. (2016). "Gendered Pathways To Educational Aspirations: The Role Of Academic Self-Concept, School Burnout, Achievement And Interest In Mathematics And Reading". *Learning and Instruction*, 46: 21-33.
- Kurt, Ş. (2006). "İşsizliğin Psiko-Sosyal Sonuçları ve Türkiye Üzerine Muhtemel Etkileri". *Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi*, (51): 357-379.
- Pajares, F. (1996). "Self-Efficacy Beliefs In Academic Settings". *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4): 543-578.
- Pajares, F., & Schunk, D. (2001). "The Development Of Academic Self-Efficacy". *Development of Achievement Motivation*. United States, 1-27.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Zusho, A. (2002). "Chapter 10 - The Development of Academic Self-Regulation: The Role of Cognitive and Motivational Factors". *Development of Achievement Motivation. (Ed.), A. Wigfield & J. S. Eccles*. San Diego: Academic Press. 249-284

<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012750053-9/50012-7>

- Öncü, H. (2012). "Akademik Öz Yeterlik Ölçeğinin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması". *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 13(1): 183-206
- Özdemir, Y. (2015). "Ortaokul Öğrencilerinde Okul Tükenmişliği: Ödev, Okula Bağlılık ve Akademik Motivasyonun Rolü". *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1): 27-35.
- Öztan, S. (2014). *Ortaokul 6.7.8. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Okul Tükenmişliklerinin Yaşam Doyumları ve Benlik Kurgusu Algıları Açısından İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*, İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. İstanbul.
- Özaydınlık, K. (2014). "Toplumsal Cinsiyet Temelinde Türkiye'de Kadın ve Eğitim". *Sosyal Politika Çalışmaları Dergisi*, (33): 93-112.
- Salmela-Aro, K., Savolainen, H., & Holopainen, L. (2009). "Depressive Symptoms and School Burnout During Adolescence: Evidence From Two Cross-Lagged Longitudinal Studies". *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(10): 1316-1327.
- Schunk, D. H., & Meece, J. L. (2005). "Self Efficacy Development In Adolescents". *Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescence*. (Eds.) Tim Urdan and Frank Pajares USA: Information Age Publishing. 71-96.
- Susman, E., Rogal, A. (2004). "Puberty and Psychological Development". *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*. (Eds.) Richard M. Lerner and Laurence Steinberg (second Edition). New Jersey: John Wiley&Sons, Inc. 15-45.
- Sümer, N., Solak, N., & Harma, M. (2013). *İşsiz Yaşam: İşsizliğin ve İş Güvencesizliğinin Birey ve Aile Üzerindeki Etkileri*. Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Urdan, T., & Schoenfelder, E. (2006). "Classroom Effects On Student Motivation: Goal Structures, Social Relationships, And Competence Beliefs". *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(5): 331-349.
- Yang, H.-J. (2004). "Factors Affecting Student Burnout And Academic Achievement In Multiple Enrollment Programs In Taiwan's Technical-Vocational Colleges". *International Journal of Educational Development*, 24(3): 283-301.
- Zhang, Y., Gan, Y. & Cham, H. (2007). "Perfectionism, Academic Burnout And Engagment Among Chinese College Students: A Structural Equation Modeling Analysis". *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43(6): 1529-1540.
- Zimmerman, B., J. & Timothy J Cleary. (2005). "Adolescent's Development Of Personal Agency, The Role Of Self-Efficacy Beliefs And Self Regulatory Skill". *Self-efficacy Beliefs of Adolescence*. (Eds.) Tim Urdan and Frank Pajares USA: Information Age Publishing. 45-69.