European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available on-line at: www.oapub.org/edu

doi: 10.5281/zenodo.376841 Volume 3 | Issue 4 | 2017

THE CAUSES OF ABSENTEEISM OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS[i]

Gürbüz Ocak[1],
İjlal Ocak[2],
Emine A. Baysal[3ii]
[1,2]Afyon Kocatepe University, Afyon, Turkey
[3]Fatih Anatolian High School, Afyon, Turkey

Abstract:
The purpose of this study is to find out the causes of high school students' absenteeism. Survey method was used. The population was comprised of 531 students in the public high schools. The data was collected with "The Scale of Absenteeism Causes" developed by the researchers. Cronbach Alpha was calculated as α=0.936. Findings show the causes of students' absenteeism aren't related to school, students themselves and their parent, however; student absenteeism causes partly from psychological reasons. Male students have more absenteeism than female students in terms of the causes of absenteeism sourced by school, students and psychological. Moreover; 9th, 10th and 11th grade students' absenteeism has bigger values than 12th grade students.

Keywords: high school students, absenteeism, causes of absenteeism

1. Introduction

Turkey's education system is mostly based upon the assumption that students should be in class every weekday. In other words, the public education system is based on the assumption that students should regularly attend school. Compulsory education laws back up this assumption in Turkey. The assumption that except for illness or the occasional doctor's appointment, family vacation, special event or crisis, students do in fact attend school every day is so strong, that it is generally not measured.

[i] This study has been supported by Afyon Kocatepe University Scientific Research Project Coordination Department (project code: 14.HIZ.DES.68).
[ii] Correspondence: email akkasemine85@hotmail.com

Absenteeism is a student behaviour grounded on physical, psychological and social reasons and affecting students' development negatively. Absenteeism can be not only a symptom of students' negative feelings about school but also sourced by many different reasons (Gökyer, 2012). Absenteeism is typically based on total days of school missed, including both excused and unexcused absences (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). The State Board of Education (2013) adopted definitions for excused and unexcused absences for use by schools and districts in order to implement the statutory policies and procedures concerning truants, and the reporting of truancy offers the three forms students' absenteeism.

In fact, students need to attend school daily to succeed. However; Ubogu (2004) says illness, financial difficulties, age, social rank, geographical region, attitudes of teachers, weak school management, high education cost and weather condition can cause absenteeism. Mervilde (1981) also reveals that; family health or financial concerns, poor school environment, drug and alcohol use, transportation problems, and differing community attitudes towards education are all conditions that can cause a child not to attend school. Literature review shows that students' absenteeism can be grouped into these sub-titles:

A. The causes of absenteeism sourced from school: School climate constituted by human relationship affects students' and teachers' behaviours (Mizelle, 1992). Students' negative thoughts about school activities, staffs' low competence and understanding, strict school management cause rebellion (Doyle, 1986). Fleming (1995), Williams (2000) and Teasley (2004) emphasize that difficulties and lack of interest in engaging classes are the reasons of absenteeism.

B. The causes of absenteeism sourced from teachers: Williams (1999), Weller (1996), Wadesango and Machingambi (2011) state teachers who are critical and have high expectations from students can cause absenteeism. Teachers' positive attitudes and behaviours affect students' dedication to school positively; however, authoritarian attitudes, lack of communication and high expectations from students can cause absenteeism (Ataman, 2001).

C. The causes of absenteeism sourced from parent: Reasons such as the parenting style, breakdown of parent, divorce of parent affects students' behaviours (Cüceloğlu, 1996). Balfanz and Byrnes (2012) express family pressure affects the continuity of students to school negatively. Home environment and family support, family contribution to school provides the continuity of students (Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1993).

D. The causes of absenteeism sourced from students: Galichon and Friedman (1985) express students are absent during class without an excuse because of boring lessons, taught in the course not complying with the expectations of employers, dislike of the teacher or course, taught in the course not being useful for students' future career

choice. Marburger (2001) takes the issue from a different point of view and says students' absenteeism is due to not being motivated to learning.

E. The causes of absenteeism sourced from psychology: King and Bernstein (2001) express students' psychological mood affects their decisions about going to school. Enomoto (1997) says when students feel being ignored by their teachers, they don't continue to school. Lotz and Lee (1999) and Durden and Ellis (2003) emphasize if the students are not motivated sufficiently and they don't have self-esteem, they generally tend to be absent at school or class.

2. Problems of the Research

In the light of the literature review, problem statements are defined as "*What are the causes of absenteeism of high school students? Do these causes indicate a significant difference in terms of some variables?*" In this context, identified sub-problems are expressed as below;

1. How is the distribution of the causes of absenteeism high school students' (according to the causes of absenteeism sourced from school; students; parent and psychology sub-dimensions)?
2. Do the causes of absenteeism indicate a significant difference in terms of gender, grade, mother and father's education level and grade point average variables according to the causes of absenteeism sourced from school; students; parent and psychology sub-dimensions?

3. Methodology of Research

The survey model was used in this study. 550 high school students were chosen randomly. Data was obtained from 531 students consisting 324 female (%61) and 207 male (%39) students. Data was gathered with "The Scale of Absenteeism Causes" developed by researchers. The total Cronbach Alpha value was calculated as α=0.937. The Cronbach Alpha values of sub-dimensions were calculated as follows; "The causes of absenteeism sourced from school" was α=.92; "The causes of absenteeism sourced from students themselves" was α=.89; "The causes of absenteeism sourced from parent" was α=.88; "The causes of absenteeism sourced from psychology" was α=.79. Frequencies, percentages, mean, t-test and one-way ANOVA tests were used in order to evaluate the data.

Before deciding what kind of tests were going to be used, Kolmogrov-Smirnov test was used to decide the normality of data (Lilliefors, 1967). The results of this test showed that the data weren't normal ($p<.05$). One of the hypotheses of using parametric tests is to provide normality. However, using parametric test is suitable for many data

which aren't normal. According to central limit theorem, even if data gained from big sample group isn't normal, the mean of them is nearly normal (Glass, Peckham, Sanders, 1972; Harwell, Rubinstein, Hayes, Olds, 1992; Lix, Keselman, Keselman, 1996). There aren't any problems in terms of normality in big sample groups (>30 or 40) (Pallant, 2007). It means that if the data isn't normal, parametric tests can be used (Elliot & Woodward, 2007). If we have a sample including hundreds of observation, the distributions of data can be ignored (Altman & Bland, 1995). Geary (1947) says that normality is a legend and data are never normal. However, the normality of the data is thought as a legend, normality graphs and tests of significance can be used (Field, 2009; Altman & Bland, 1995). So in this study, frequencies, percentage, the means of items, t-test and one-way Anova were used.

4. Results

4.1 How is the distribution of the causes of absenteeism high school students' (according to the causes of absenteeism sourced from school (1st); students (2nd); parent (3rd) and psychology (4th) sub-dimensions)?

Table 1: Frequencies, Percentages and Means of the First Dimension

(1=Never 2=Sometimes 3=Often 4=Usually 5=Always)

Items	F %	1	2	3	4	5	X	Result
I remain absent of school …								
1- when courses are boring.	f	271	98	78	16	18	1.77	1
	%	56.3	20.4	16.2	3.3	3.7		
4- because of violence at school.	f	455	15	2	4	5	1.10	1
	%	94.6	3.1	0.4	0.8	1.0		
6- due to the lack of social facilities at school.	f	386	42	26	13	14	1.39	1
	%	80.2	8.7	5.4	2.7	2.9		
10- because of unsympathetic school management.	f	357	69	29	12	14	1.45	1
	%	74.2	14.3	6.0	2.5	2.9		
11- when there are courses taught by teachers I dislike.	f	288	87	44	28	34	1.82	1
	%	59.9	18.1	9.1	5.8	7.1		
12- due to authoritarian teachers.	f	373	55	27	14	12	1.41	1
	%	77.5	11.4	5.6	2.9	2.5		
13- due to intolerant teachers.	f	324	73	39	21	24	1.64	1
	%	67.4	15.2	8.1	4.4	5.0		
14- because teachers don't encourage me.	f	383	48	23	10	17	1.39	1
	%	79.6	10.0	4.8	2.1	3.5		
15- because teachers don't support me.	f	381	53	22	9	16	1.39	1
	%	79.2	11.0	4.6	1.9	3.3		

16- because teachers don't make the lessons enjoyable.	f	284	97	49	23	28	1.78	1
	%	59.0	20.2	10.2	4.8	5.8		
17- because of inconsiderate teachers.	f	339	67	36	20	19	1.57	1
	%	70.5	13.9	7.5	4.2	4.0		
35- when I don't want to listen to course.	f	353	64	29	14	21	1.51	1
	%	73.4	13.3	6.0	2.9	4.4		
37- when there is a course of a teacher whom I have experienced problems.	f	331	71	32	20	27	1.62	1
	%	68.8	14.8	6.7	4.2	5.6		

Table 1 shows students don't remain absent of school because of the causes sourced from school. Because most of the students answer items in this sub-dimension in "never" interval. For instance, %94.6 of students don't agree the item which says "I remain absent of school because of violence at school". The mean of this sub-dimension is 1.52.

Table 2: Frequencies, Percentages and Means of the Second Dimension

Items	**F**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**X**	**Result**
	%							
I remain absent of school …								
43- because I have to work for economic reasons.	f	446	14	7	3	11	1.16	1
	%	92.7	2.9	1.5	0.6	2.3		
44- because I am alone at school.	f	392	43	18	8	20	1.38	1
	%	81.5	8.9	3.7	1.7	4.2		
48- because our house is far away from school.	f	420	25	18	8	10	1.25	1
	%	87.3	5.2	3.7	1.7	2.1		
49- because my friends are from out of school environment.	f	412	26	28	2	13	1.29	1
	%	85.7	5.4	5.8	0.4	2.7		
51- when I don't have course materials.	f	418	36	14	5	8	1.23	1
	%	86.9	7.5	2.9	1.0	1.7		
52- because I don't have life safety at school.	f	434	19	9	3	16	1.22	1
	%	90.2	4.0	1.9	0.6	3.3		
53- before and after public holidays.	f	372	53	27	10	19	1.44	1
	%	77.3	11.0	5.6	2.1	4.0		
54- because I make the commute out of province.	f	394	45	14	10	18	1.36	1
	%	81.9	9.4	2.9	2.1	3.7		
55- because of the crowded classrooms.	f	436	19	8	4	14	1.21	1
	%	90.6	4.0	1.7	0.8	2.9		
56- because of future anxiety.	f	441	22	5	3	10	1.16	1
	%	91.7	4.6	1.0	0.6	2.1		
60- because I don't benefit from guide service at school.	f	427	22	8	6	18	1.26	1
	%	88.8	4.6	1.7	1.2	3.7		

Most of the students answer the items in this sub-dimension as "never". According to this, students don't think that the causes of their absenteeism aren't related to themselves and the situations affecting them. The mean of this sub-dimension is 1.26.

Table 3: Frequencies, Percentages and Means of the Third Dimension

Items	F %	1	2	3	4	5	X	Result
I remain absent of school …								
19- because my parent is divorced.	f	471	4	2	-	4	1.04	1
	%	97.9	0.8	0.4	-	0.8		
20- because my father/mother is disabled.	f	476	1	1	1	2	1.02	1
	%	99.0	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.4		
21- because I have to support my family financially.	f	447	15	13	1	5	1.13	1
	%	92.9	3.1	2.7	0.2	1.0		
25- because I have to take care of my sisters or brothers.	f	466	6	4	1	4	1.06	1
	%	96.9	1.2	0.8	0.2	0.8		
28- because of family pressure.	f	455	10	9	-	7	1.11	1
	%	94.6	2.1	1.9	-	1.5		

Table 3 shows that most of the students answer to the items in this sub-dimensions as "never" interval. That is, students don't think that their absenteeism reasons aren't related to their parent. The mean of this sub-dimension is 1.07.

Table 4: Frequencies, Percentages and Means of the Fourth Dimension

Items	F %	1	2	3	4	5	X	Result
I remain absent of school …								
29- when I am sick.	f	39	121	151	81	89	3.12	3
	%	8.1	25.2	31.4	16.8	18.5		
30- when I don't feel well psychologically.	f	196	132	72	42	39	2.16	1
	%	40.7	27.4	15.0	8.7	8.1		
31- when I am late to school.	f	273	93	55	31	29	1.85	1
	%	56.8	19.3	11.4	6.4	6.0		
34- at the first and the last week of school.	f	172	101	73	49	86	2.53	1
	%	35.8	21.0	15.2	10.2	17.9		
40- when one of my relatives.	f	129	137	93	38	84	2.60	2
	%	26.8	28.5	19.3	7.9	17.5		

Table 4 shows most of the students answer to the items in this sub-dimension as "sometimes", "never" and "often" interval. The mean is 2.45.

4.2.1 Do the causes of high school students' absenteeism indicate a significant difference in terms of gender?

In table 5, there are t-test results. In the first sub-dimension, the mean of female students is 17.50 while that of male is 23.13. In the second sub-dimension, the mean of female students is 12.69 however that of male students is 15.77. In the third sub-dimension, the mean of female students is 5.31 while that of male students is 5.49. In the last sub-dimension, the mean of female students is 11.33 as that of male students is 13.57. In all dimensions of the scale the mean of male students is higher than that of female students. For the effect size value (eta-squared) which shows to what extend the impact of independent variable is on the dependent variable, Cohen's *d* has been used. If the effect size value is calculated as $0,01 \leq \eta^2 < 0,06$, it means there is "low level effect"; if it is calculated as $0,06 \leq \eta^2 < 0,14$, it means there is "middle level effect"; if it is calculated as $\eta^2 \geq 0,14$, it means there is "large level effect" (Cohen, 1988).

Table 5: t-test Results for Gender

Sub-Dimensions	Gender	N	X	SS	t	P	Eta-Squared (η^2)
The causes of absenteeism sourced from…							
school	Female	324	17.50	6.97	-	.00*	0.069
	Male	207	23.13	11.64	6.27		
students	Female	324	12.69	3.67	-	.00*	0.047
	Male	207	15.77	8.14	5.12		
parent	Female	324	5.31	1.78	-	.23	
	Male	207	5.49	1.74	1.18		
psychology		324	11.33	4.19	-	.00*	0.046
	Female	207	13.57	5.36	5.09		
	Male						

*p<0.05

There is a significant difference in the first, second and third sub-dimensions (p<.05) while there isn't a significant difference in the fourth sub-dimension (p>.05). Male students remain absent of school more than female students in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school, students, parent and psychology sub-dimensions. Gender variable has middle ($0,06 \leq \eta 2$) level effect on the causes of absenteeism sourced from school sub-dimension; low ($0,01 \leq \eta^2 < 0,06$) level effect on the causes of absenteeism sourced from students and psychology sub-dimensions.

4.2.2 Do the causes of high school students' absenteeism indicate a significant difference in terms of grade?

In table 6, there are one-way ANOVA results. Variances are homogeneous in the causes of absenteeism sourced from students, parent and psychology while variance isn't homogeneous in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school (The first sub-dimension: .00[p<.05]; The second sub-dimension: .23; The third sub-dimension: .59; The fourth sub-dimension: .49 [p>.05]). When variances are homogeneous and the number of groups are high, Tukey test can be used; however, when variances are not homogeneous, Dunnett's C test can be used (Sipahi, Yurtoku & Çinko, 2008; Büyüköztürk, 2012). Therefore, in the first sub-dimension Dunnett's C test is used; as in the second, third and fourth sub-dimensions Tukey test is used. Also, for the effect size value Cohen's *f* is calculated.

Table 6: One-way ANOVA Results for Grade Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Grade	N	SS	X	F	p	Difference	Eta-Squared(η^2)
The causes of absenteeism sourced from…								
school	9	144	7.14	17.27	4.941	.00*	9-10	0.027
	10	202	10.35	20.52			9-11	
	11	146	8.99	20.21				
	12	39	12.29	22.38				
students	9	144	5.84	13.57	1.252	.29		
	10	202	6.65	14.01				
	11	146	5.22	13.59				
	12	39	5.97	15.53				
parent	9	144	1.85	5.35	0.161	.92		
	10	202	2.05	5.39				
	11	146	1.08	5.35				
	12	39	1.95	5.56				
psychology	9	144	4.58	11.28	3.478	.01*	9-11	0.019
	10	202	4.82	12.14				
	11	146	4.82	12.99				
	12	39	5.04	13.00				

*p<0.05

There is a significant difference in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school and psychology sub-dimensions (p<.05). Tukey and Dunnett's C tests show the difference in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school sub-dimension is between 9th-10th grades and 9th-11th grades. There isn't a significant difference in the causes of absenteeism sourced from students and parent (p>.05). The effect size of grade variables

on the causes of absenteeism sourced from school and psychology sub-dimensions is low ($0,0 \leq \eta^2 < 0,06$) level.

4.2.3 Do the causes of high school students' absenteeism indicate a significant difference in terms of mother's education level?

In table 7, there are one-way ANOVA results. Variances are homogeneous in the causes of absenteeism sourced from students, parent and psychology while variance isn't homogeneous in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school (The first sub-dimension: .03[p<.05]; The second sub-dimension: .63; The third sub-dimension: .16; The fourth sub-dimension: .35 [p>.05]).

Table 7: One-way ANOVA Results for Mother's Education Level Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Education Level	N	SS	X	F	p	Eta-Squared(η^2)
The causes of absenteeism sourced from…							
school	Primary S.	284	8.56	18.76	2.685	.04*	0.015
	Secondary S.	145	10.43	20.05			
	High S.	89	10.43	21.68			
	University	13	8.54	22.46			
students	Primary S.	284	6.05	13.81	0.194	.90	
	Secondary S.	145	6.42	13.77			
	High S.	89	5.63	14.33			
	University	13	2.98	13.92			
parent	Primary S.	284	2.20	5.45	.423	.73	
	Secondary S.	145	1.01	5.31			
	High S.	89	1.23	5.31			
	University	13	0.27	5.07			
psychology	Primary S.	284	4.85	11.91	1.031	.37	
	Secondary S.	145	4.54	12.53			
	High S.	89	5.16	12.40			
	University	13	13.69	13.69			

4.2.4 Do the causes of high school students' absenteeism indicate a significant difference in terms of father's education level?

In Table 8, one-way ANOVA results related to father's education level are shown. Variances are homogeneous in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school, students and psychology sub-dimensions while variance isn't homogeneous in the causes of absenteeism sourced from parent (The third sub-dimension: .00[p<.05]; The first sub-dimension: .09; The second sub-dimension: .16; The fourth sub-dimension: 92 [p>.05]).

Table 8: One-way ANOVA Results for Father's Education Level Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Education Level	N	SS	X	F	p	Difference	Eta-Squared(η^2)
The causes of absenteeism sourced from...								
school	Primary S.	156	9.67	19.10	3.776	.01*	Primary S.-University	0.021
	Secondary S.	164	8.75	18.46			Secondary S.-University	
	High S.	144	9.38	20.29				
	University	67	10.31	22.80				
students	Primary S.	156	6.14	14.05	0.758	.51		
	Secondary S.	164	7.50	14.01				
	High S.	144	3.85	13.29				
	University	67	5.49	14.50				
parent	Primary S.	156	1.92	5.47	1.389	.24		
	Secondary S.	164	2.35	5.54				
	High S.	144	0.98	5.18				
	University	67	0.66	5.20				
psychology	Primary S.	156	4.83	11.73	2.540	.05		
	Secondary S.	164	4.61	11.90				
	High S.	144	4.88	12.45				
	University	67	4.88	13.52				

*p<0.05

In the causes of absenteeism sourced from students, parent, psychology sub-dimensions, there isn't a significant difference (p>.05). However, there is a significant difference in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school sub-dimension (p<.05). Differences are between primary school-university and secondary school-university. To the effect size value, father's education level variable has low ($0,01 \leq \eta^2 < 0,06$) level effect on the causes of absenteeism sourced from school.

4.2.5 Do the causes of high school students' absenteeism indicate a significant difference in terms of grade point average?

In Table 9, there are results about one-way variance analysis. According to Levene, the variance is homogeneous in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th factors however it is not homogeneous in 1st factor. In order to define the cause of this difference Dunnett's C and for the effect size Cohen's *f* is used.

Table 9: One-way ANOVA Results for Grade Point Average Variable

Sub-Dimensions	Grade Point Average	N	SS	X	F	P	DIFFERENCES	Eta-Squared(η^2)
The causes of absenteeism sourced from..								
school	0-49,99	23	9.21	20.13	5.477	.00*	Between 50-59,99 and 70-84,99	0.039
	50-59,99	140	10.44	22.29				
	60-69,99	185	10.34	19.91				
	70-84,99	172	6.84	17.37				
	85-100	11	9.85	18.27				
students	0-49,99	23	3.25	13.47	1.366	.24		
	50-59,99	140	7.21	14.72				
	60-69,99	185	6.94	14.01				
	70-84,99	172	3.92	13.24				
	85-100	11	2.42	12.45				
parent	0-49,99	23	0.76	5.30	0.073	.99		
	50-59,99	140	1.82	5.33				
	60-69,99	185	2.14	5.42				
	70-84,99	172	1.37	5.40				
	85-100	11	0.90	5.27				
psychology	0-49,99	23	4.44	11.82	1.338	.25		
	50-59,99	140	5.17	12.83				
	60-69,99	185	4.72	12.31				
	70-84,99	172	4.57	11.61				
	85-100	11	5.42	12.54				

*p<0.05

There is a significant difference in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school sub-dimension (p<.05). The source of difference is between 50-59,99 and 70-84,99 grade point averages. There aren't any significant differences in other sub-dimensions. The effect size value shows grade point average variable has low ($0,01 \leq \eta^2 < 0,06$) level effect on the causes of absenteeism sourced from school sub-dimension.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

According to findings students' absenteeism isn't affected from the causes of absenteeism sourced from school. Gökyer (2012) states most of the students either agree or partly agree the items related to the causes of absenteeism sourced from school. This finding is complied with the results of this study. Wadesango and Machingambi (2011) say poor teaching strategies of teachers, boring learning environment, poor social-economic situations and weak student-teacher relationship bring about absenteeism.

However, most of the students don't agree the items which are similar to those of in our study. Suhid, Aroff and Kamal (2012) express students' absenteeism are related to strict school management, crowded classrooms and harsh school rules.

In this study, most of the students express their opinions as "never" interval to the items in the causes of absenteeism sourced from student sub-dimension. However, in Gökyer's (2012) study, students answer the similar items as "I agree" or "I partly agree" intervals. In Shahzada, Ghazi, Nawz and Khan's (2011) study, it can be seen that students remain absent of school because of homework.

Most of the students answer the items in the causes of absenteeism sourced from as "never" intervals. The findings in Gökyer's (2012) study support the findings in this study. Shahzada and friends (2011) express that an important number of male students remain absent of school because of family pressure.

Most of the students in this study answer the items in the causes of absenteeism sourced from psychology as "sometimes", "often" and "never" intervals. Shahzada and friends (2011) have reached that most of the students remain absent from school for fear that they could be punished. Balfanz and Byrnes (2012) have found that most of the students are absent at school because of illness.

Komakech and Ossu (2014) express in their study, most of the students remain absent of school because of lack of materials of lessons, obligation of working somewhere, un-interest of their families, not being provided lunch at school, sexual abuse, living far away from school, illness or epidemic, death of one of the family members or relatives, peer influence and violence. These overlap with the findings in this study.

Male students remain absent of school more than female students in the causes of absenteeism sourced from school, students and psychology sub-dimensions. Malcolm, Wilson, Davidson and Kirk (2003) say in their studies, female students in 7th, 8th and 9th grades remain absent of school more than male students in the same grades. When dealt with in terms of gender, these findings don't overlap with our study's.

Findings of the study show that students in the 9th, 10th and 11th grade students remain absent of school because of school and their psychology. Moreover, there is a meaningful difference between the students whose mother are graduated from university and primary school. Furthermore, students whose father are graduated from primary school remain absent of school more than students whose father are graduated from secondary school and university.

Balfanz and Byrnes (2012) reveal that chronic absenteeism is most prevalent among low-income students. Gender and ethnic background do not appear to play a role in this. The youngest and the oldest students tend to have the highest rates of chronic absenteeism, with students attending most regularly in third through fifth

grades. Chronic absenteeism begins to rise in middle school and continues climbing through 12th grade, with seniors often having the highest rate of all. The data also suggests that chronic absenteeism is concentrated in relatively few schools, with 15 percent of schools in Florida, for example, accounting for at least half of all chronically absent students.

Komakech ve Osuu (2014) have revealed in his study that 20.7% of the students absent themselves because they lack scholastic requirements or materials such as; books, pens, uniforms, calculators, and additional fees contribution like; field work fee, school bus contribution. 12.4% of the student absenteeism in Uganda schools. Students who are homeless and staying with friends, relatives are more absent from school than those staying with their biological parents for instance in rural areas; they have to wake up very early in the morning and go to the garden, fetch enough water for use, then prepare for school depending on the time the task is accomplished and sometimes are told to remain to do the construction work. Hunger at school was ranked fourth as one of the cause of students' absenteeism. This implies that 8.9% of the total absenteeism in a school is caused by hunger or lack of mid-day meals.

Reference

1. Altman D.G. & Bland J.M. (1995). Statistics notes: the normal distribution. *Bmj, 310/6975*, 298.
2. Ataman, A. (2001). Sınıf İçinde Karşılaşılan Davranış Problemleri ve Bunlara Karşı Geliştirilen Önlemler. *Sınıf Yönetiminde Yeni Yaklaşımlar* (Ed. Leyla Küçükahmet). Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.
3. Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2012). *The Importance of Being in School: A Report on Absenteeism in the Nation's Public Schools.* John Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools: Baltimore.
4. Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2012). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı. İstatistik, Araştırma Deseni, SPSS Uygulamaları ve Yorum*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
5. Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
6. Cüceloğlu, D. (1996). İnsan ve Davranışı. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
7. Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom Organisation and Management. Merlin C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching.* (Third Ed.) (392-431). New York: Macmillan Pub. Comp.

8. Durden, G. C., & Ellis, L. V. (2003). Is Class Attendance a Proxy Variable for Student Motivation in Economics Classes?: An Empirical Analysis. *International Social Science Review, 78,* 22-34.
9. Enomoto, E. (1997). Negotiating the Ethics of Care and Justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 33*, 351-370.
10. Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statics Using SPSS for Windows*. Sage Publications: London.
11. Fleming, N. (1995). *Attendance.* Why don't They Attend? London: Macmillan Press. Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA): *Basic Education Sector Analysis Report, 2012.*
12. Galichon, J. P., & Friedman, H. H. (1985). Cutting college classes: An investigation. *College Student Journal*, *19*, 357-360.
13. Geary, R.C., (1947). Testing for normality. *Biometrika, 34,* 209-242.
14. Glass, G.V., Peckham, P.D., & Sanders, J.R. (1972). Consequences of failure to meet assumptions underlying fixed effects analyses of variance and covariance. *Review of Educational Research, 42,* 237-288.
15. Gökyer, N. (2012). Ortaöğretim Okullarındaki Devamsızlık Nedenlerine İlişkin Öğrenci Görüşleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 20/3*, 913-938.
16. Harwell, Rubinstein, Hayers, Old (1992) Harwell, M.R., Rubinstein, E. N., Hayes, W. S. ve Olds, C. C. (1992). Summarizing Monte Carlo results in methodological research: the one- and two-factor fixed effects ANOVA cases. *Journal of Educational Statistic, 17*, 315-339.
17. King, N., & Bernstein, G. A. (2001). School refusal in children and adolescents: A review of the past 10 years. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. 40,* 197-205.
18. Komakech, R. A., & Osuu, J. R. (2014). Students' Absenteeism: A Silent Killer of Universal Seconday Education (Use) in Uganda. *International Journal of Education Research, 2/10,* 418-436.
19. Lilliefors, H. W. (1967). On the Kolmogrov Smirnov Test for Normality with Mean and Variance Unknown. *Journal of American Statistical Association, 62/318*, 399-402.
20. Lix, L.M., Keselman, J.C. ve Keselman, H.J. (1996). Consequences of assumption violations revisited: A quantitative review of alternatives to the one-way analysis of variance F test. *Review of Educational Research, 66*, 579-619.
21. Lotz, R., & Lee, L. (1999). *Sociability, School Experience, and Delinquency. Youth & Society 31/3,* 199- 224.

22. Malcolm, H., Wilson, V., Davidson, J., & Kirk, S. (2003). *Absence from School: A study of its causes and effects in seven LEAs.* The SCRE Centre University of Glasgow: Glasgow.
23. Marburger, D. R. (2001). Absenteeism and Undergraduate Exam Performance. *Journal of Economic Education*, *32/2*, 99-109.
24. Mervilde, J. (1981). *Student Absenteeism: Causes, Effects, and Possible Solutions.* Thesis for the University of Indiana at South Bend, USA.
25. Mizelle, M. (1992). The Meaning of School Reform. In Council of Chief State School Officers, Investing in Youth: A Compilation of Recommended Policies and Practices, pp. 9 -12.
26. Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS survival manual, a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. Sydney: McGraw Hill.
27. Pryor, S. (2013). Guidelines for Excused and Unexcused Absences. *Connecticut State Department of Education, 1-17*.
28. Shahzada, G., Ghazi, S.R., Nawaz, H., & Khan, A. (2011). Causes of Absenteeism from the Schools at Secondary Level. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 2/2*, 291-298.
29. Sipahi, B., Yurtkoru, E.S., & Çinko, M. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde SPSS ile Veri Analizi*, İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
30. Suhid, A., Aroff, A. R. Md., & Kamal, N. (2012). Factors Causing Student Absenteeism According to Peers. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce, 1/4*, 342-350.
31. Teasley, M. L. (2004). Absenteeism and Truancy. *Children and Schools, 26*, 117-127.
32. Ubogu, R. E. (2004). *The Causes of Absenteeism and Dropout among Secondary School Students in Delta Central Senatorial District of Delta State.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Delta State University, Nigeria: Abraka.
33. Wadesango, N., & Machingambi, S. (2011). Causes and Structural Effects of Student Absenteeism: A Case Study of Three South African Universities, *J Soc Sci, 26/2*, 89-97.
34. Wang, M.C., Haertel, G.D., & Walberg, H.J. (1993). Toward a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research, 63*, 249-294.
35. Weller D.L. (1996). The next generation of school reform. *Quality Progress, 29*, 65-70.
36. Williams B. (1999). *Education, Social Structure and Development: A Comparative Analysis*. London: Macmillan Press.
37. Williams L.L. (2000). Student Absenteeism and Truancy: Technologies and interventions to Reduce Chronic Problems among School-Age Children. *Journal of Children, 7*, 23-34.