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Abstract

While the Covid-19 pandemic caused a sudden transition to online education in higher education, university students faced many unexpected situations. In this direction, in this study, it was aimed to determine the resilience, academic burnout and perceived social support levels of teacher candidates during the adaptation process to online education and to reveal the effect of perceived social support and resilience on academic burnout. This study was designed according to the relational survey model and 'Maslach Burnout Inventory-Student Form' and 'Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support' and 'Short Psychological Resilience Scale' were used as data collection tools. The sample of the research consists of 367 education faculty students who are studying at a private university in the 2020-2021 academic year, determined by the random sampling method, one of the purposeful sampling methods. According to the results obtained from the research findings perceived social support and resilience variables together explain approximately 3% of the total variance in burnout.
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Introduction

It can be said that the Covid-19 epidemic has caused major and important changes in education systems around the world. During the epidemic, many countries had to take a break from face-to-face education and switch to the online education model. In this direction, states have taken decisions regarding the implementation of online education systems for the sustainability of education within the framework of health measures. In Turkey, on Monday, March 23, 2020, it has been decided by the Higher Education Institution to start the distance education process at associate, undergraduate and graduate levels in all universities with distance education capacity. In order for online education to become more efficient and functional for students, it is important to reveal the academic burnout, resilience and perceived social support levels of university students in this process and the relationships between these levels.

Resilience

Resilience can be defined as the ability to quickly get rid of diseases, psychological problems, negative experiences or stress, to heal and to recover oneself (Carver, 1998; Smith et al, 2008; Tusaie & Dyer, 2004). In other words, resilience is one's ability to successfully overcome adverse conditions and adapt to new situations; (Doğan, 2015); it is the state of a person to recover, focus on success and continue his purpose in order to achieve success when faced with difficulties and problems; (Richardson, 2002); features and protective mechanisms that enable adaptation to danger, threats, and challenges (Benard, 1991). Psychological resilience makes it easier to resist stressful situations and events (Terzi, 2008). Since individuals with high resilience have a higher stress threshold, they are expected to perform with higher motivation in conflict, crisis, change and other critical situations. (Bitmiş et al, 2013).

The concept of resilience is a personality trait consisting of three sub-dimensions: attachment, difficulty and control (Crowley et al, 2003). The control dimension of resilience is related to the belief in the controllability of events and individual reactions. Those who have this belief think that they can control the stressful situation and turn it to their advantage. The control dimension is associated with the concepts of self-control, achievement motivation, autonomy and willingness (Crowley et al, 2003; Motan & Gençöz, 2009). The difficulty dimension consists of the individual's ability to adapt to change and to see the change process as an opportunity to improve himself (Crowley et al, 2003; Kayacı & Özbay, 2016). The Attachment dimension can be defined as the individual's finding his/her life meaningful, having a purpose, and doing his best as a result of his commitment to life (Crowley et al, 2003).

The individual's attachment to different relationships, beliefs and value judgments such as his/her social environment, work environment and family creates a source of strength for the
individual to cope with stressful situations and events (İşık, 2016). At this point, it is necessary to mention the concept of social support, which is another subject of this research.

**Perceived social support**

In recent years, research on social support has focused on whether a person's social relationships are supportive enough, that is, one's own impressions of perceived support. In addition to having social support quantitatively, the individual must perceive the existence of social support or feel social support (Bayrak & Bülbül, 2013). The existence of social support for university students facilitates the student's adaptation to university life by affecting their academic and social relations at the university (Baş & Kabasakal, 2013; Dikmen et al, 2017; Topkaya & Kavas, 2015). Studies have reported that as the social support of university students increases, their life satisfaction and ability to empathize with the other person increase, and their feeling of loneliness and hopelessness decreases (Bayrak & Bülbül, 2013; Kacur & Atak 2011). In addition, it was concluded that the decrease in the perception of the social support of university students negatively affects the quality of life of the students, and as a result, mental health problems occur in the students (Alsubaie et al. 2019).

Perceived social support is expressed as the cognitive evaluation or impression of individuals' social networks established with each other in terms of quality and existence (Aydıner Boylu et al., 2019; Yıldız & Dirlik, 2019). In the formation of evaluations and impressions, the past experiences, current cognitive structure and emotional state of the person can be determinative. In this context, it is possible to say that the family, which is the first source of early experiences, has a strong role in the formation of the mentioned evaluations and impressions. The family is an important actor in the development of social support skills (Taylor, 2011). study conducted by Wang et al. (2018), in which they examined studies on perceived social support, results were obtained regarding the negative effects of recovery and social functionality in addition to depression symptoms in groups with low perception of social support. In addition, in many studies in the literature, it has been observed that there is a negative relationship between the perception of social support and the level of depression (Gökdağlı, 2014). Similarly, in a study conducted with university students, it was concluded that the perception of social support has a role in reducing depression and anxiety symptoms (Shao et al., 2020). In different studies in the literature, it has been determined that the level of anxiety decreases as the perceived social support level increases (Zhou et al., 2013).

Social support is all kinds of personal, social, psychological and economic assistance processes such as honest and empathetic response, interest, trust, respect, appreciation, information and financial assistance that the individual receives from his/her environment (Hefner & Eisenberg, 2009). The balance between the student's wishes and the expectations of environment from the student is among the factors affecting academic burnout.
Academic Burnout

Freudenberger (1974) considered burnout only from an emotional point of view and defined it as a negative state that occurs as a result of failure, fatigue, loss of energy and power or unmet demands. On the other hand, Maslach and Jackson (1981), defined burnout in three sub-dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and the feeling of falling in personal achievement. According to Maslach and Jackson (1981), burnout is a physical and mental syndrome that includes physical exhaustion, long-term fatigue, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, as well as negative attitudes towards work, life and other people. School burnout, or academic burnout, which is a valid concept for students, arises from the discrepancy between students' own deficiencies in their studies at school and the expectations of their environment and their own wishes. School burnout can be defined as a decrease in students' belief and interest in school, which is associated with academic stress (Schaufeli et al., 2002). Zhang, Gan, and Cham (2005) suggested that the symptoms of academic burnout are feeling tired, apathy towards homework, indifferent attitudes and behaviors towards lessons, depersonalization, feeling inadequate, and decreased productivity. Studies show that academic school engagement, stress, relationship with teachers and friends, academic self-efficacy and academic achievement predict burnout (Schaufeli et al, 2002; Zhang et al, 2005). Breso et al. (2007) found that female students had higher burnout levels. When the research findings of Stoeber et al., (2011) are examined, it is seen that willing work creates a significant difference in burnout levels and academic achievement depending on individual differences among students. Ören and Türkoğlu (2006), in their study on academic burnout in prospective teachers, concluded that male students experienced higher levels of academic burnout in the personal achievement and depersonalization dimension of burnout, and female students in the emotional exhaustion dimension. In the same study, it was concluded that students older than 23 years of age had higher academic burnout levels. In the study examining the relationship between high school students' academic burnout and their perceived social support level (Kutsal & Bilge, 2012), it was seen that students' perceived social support levels predicted their burnout scores.

Due to the sudden transition to online education due to the Covid19 epidemic, all stakeholders of the education system have had many positive and negative experiences regarding online education. University students had to learn all the positive and negative effects of the online education process by experiencing them personally. Considering that the online education model is likely to be used together with the face-to-face education model after the epidemic, examining the academic burnout, social support perceptions and psychological resilience of teacher candidates in the online education process will contribute to minimizing the problems experienced by the students in the online education process and completing the inadequate elements.
Purpose of the research

In this context, the aim of this study is to examine the relationships between teacher candidates' social support perception, psychological resilience and academic burnout levels during the pandemic period and to determine the predictive value of teacher candidates' social support perception and resilience levels on academic burnout. In line with this main purpose, answers are sought for the following research questions:

RQ1: To what degree do prospective teachers resilience, academic burnout and perceived social support?

RQ2: Are there any significant difference in prospective teachers’ levels of psychological resilience, academic burnout and perceived social support in terms of gender, grade, section?

RQ3: Are there any significant relationship among resilience, academic burnout and perceived social support levels of prospective teachers?

RQ4: Do prospective teachers' perceived social support and resilience levels predict academic burnout?

Method

Research Model

In this study, predictive research design, which is one of the quantitative research correlation scanning models, was used. The predictive research model is a preferred research model to predict or understand future behavior and to identify the independent variables that predict the dependent variable (Creswell, 2017). With the predictive research model, it is aimed to analyze the relationships between the social support perception, resilience and academic burnout levels of prospective teachers' and to determine the predictive value of prospective teachers' social support perceptions and resilience levels on academic burnout during online education.

Participants

The universe of the research consists of 1496 teacher candidates studying at the education faculty of a private university in Istanbul in the 2020-2021 academic year. 291 prospective teachers randomly selected from this universe constitute the sample of the research. Using an online survey tool with simple random sampling produced a large dataset, but we have no way of knowing what the response rate was or how many students saw the online survey invitation and chose not to respond. Information about the gender, grade and section of the students is shown in Table 1.
Table 1 shows that 82.1% of the participants are women and 17.9% are men. 45.4% of these participants completed the first two years of university education, and 54.6% completed the last two years with the online education process. When the sections of the participants are examined, it is seen that 36.4% of the participants are in the basic education department, 24.7% from the pre-school education department, 22.3% from the language education department and 16.5% from the psychological counseling department.

**Data Collection Tools**

The materials of the study include the following scales administered as part of an online questionnaire. A personal information form was used to obtain information about the participants' genders, departments and which grade they were in.

Turkish Adaptation of the Short Resilience Scale (Doğan, 2015). A six-item scale of resilience was used. Higher total scores indicated higher resilience. Cronbach's alpha = 0.83.

Revised Form of Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Eker et al., 2001). A 13-item scale of perceived social support was used. The scale has 13 questions rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree; 7 = totally agree). Three subscales were included: family support, friend support and special person support. Cronbach’s alpha = 0.89.

Turkish Adaptation of the Maslach Burnout Inventory: Student Survey (Capri, et al., 2011). A 12-item scale of burnout for students was used. The scale has 12 questions rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = never happens; 5 = always happens). Higher scores indicated a more serious degree of academic burnout. Three subscales were included: exhaustion, cynicism and inefficiency. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was 0.76 for the first sub-factor, 0.82 for the second sub-factor, and 0.61 for the third sub-factor. The survey, which was administered through Google
Docs between March 29 and April 12, 2021, was shared via the e-mail addresses of education faculty students to create a simple random sample. During the web survey, which received 291 responses, the participants were told that they could stop participating in the research at any time if they were uncomfortable sharing information about themselves.

**Findings**

The data on the levels of resilience, burnout and perceived social support of teacher candidates are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Descriptive analysis results of prospective teachers’ scores for resilience, burnout and perceived social support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Subscales</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Burnout</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficiency</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived social support</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend support</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special person support</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 1, the average general academic burnout level of the participants is between 3.00 and 4.00 points. In other words, the academic burnout level of undergraduate students is between “sometimes” and “always” (mean=3.08, SD=0.63). The academic burnout variables with the highest scores were inefficiency variable (mean=3.24, SD=0.74), emotional exhaustion variable (mean=3.11, SD=1.09) and cynicism variable (mean=2.89, SD=1.11), respectively. It is seen that the perceived social support levels of teacher candidates are between 4.00 and 5.00 (mean=4.88, SD=1.36) and the highest scored perceived social support variable is peer support (mean=5.27, SD=2.18). Perception of friend support is followed by family support (mean=5.06, SD=1.57) and personal support (mean=4.32, SD=1.52). The mean score of the resilience variable is moderate (mean=2.97) and the standard deviation score is 0.37.

Table 3. t-test values of academic burnout and perceived social support in terms of gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Subscale</th>
<th>Female (n=239)</th>
<th>Male (n=52)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>3.10±1.09</td>
<td>3.16±1.12</td>
<td>-3.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>2.84±1.11</td>
<td>3.12±1.05</td>
<td>-1.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficiency</td>
<td>3.25±0.75</td>
<td>3.21±0.70</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.06±0.63</td>
<td>3.16±0.66</td>
<td>-1.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to Table 3, no significant difference between genders was found in terms of academic burnout and perceived social support. The differences in resilience variable according to gender is shown in Table 4.

### Table 4. Mann Whitney U-test values of resilience in terms of gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>U-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Female (n=239)</td>
<td>146,20</td>
<td>34942,00</td>
<td>6166,00</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (n=52)</td>
<td>145,08</td>
<td>7544,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as mean rank-sum of rank. *p<0.05.

According to table 4, no significant difference between genders was found in term of resilience. The differences in academic burnout and perceived social support variables according to grade are shown in Table 5.

### Table 5. t-test values of academic burnout and perceived social support in terms of grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>1st and 2nd Grade (n=132)</th>
<th>3rd and 4th Grade (n=159)</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Burnout</td>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>3,186±1,06</td>
<td>3,062±1,12</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>2,822±1,07</td>
<td>2,948±1,13</td>
<td>-.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inefficiency</td>
<td>3,362±.75</td>
<td>3,147±.72</td>
<td>2.470*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,123±.61</td>
<td>3,052±.65</td>
<td>-.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived social support</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>4,943±1,60</td>
<td>5,170±1,55</td>
<td>-1.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>5,349±1,45</td>
<td>5,204±1,57</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special person</td>
<td>4,329±2,14</td>
<td>4,329±2,22</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,874±1,36</td>
<td>4,901±1,36</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as mean±standard deviation. *p<0.05.

According to table 5, no significant difference between grades was found in terms of the variables of academic burnout and perceived social support. However, it was observed that the students who studied their first two years at the university had higher scores on the inefficiency dimension than the students who studied the last two years. The differences in resilience variable according to grade is shown in Table 6.
Table 6. Mann Whitney U-test values of resilience in terms of grade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
<th>U-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>1st and 2nd Grade</td>
<td>146,02</td>
<td>19275,00</td>
<td>10491,00</td>
<td>,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=132)</td>
<td>145,98</td>
<td>23211,00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd and 4th Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=159)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as mean rank-sum of rank. *p<0.05.

According to Table 6, no significant difference between grades was found in term of the variable of resilience. The differences in academic burnout and perceived social support variables according to department are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. F values of academic burnout and perceived social support in terms of department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Basic Ed. (n=106)</th>
<th>Psychological Counseling (n=48)</th>
<th>Language Teaching (n=65)</th>
<th>Preschool Education (n=72)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Bonferroni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Burnout</td>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>3,01 ±1,06</td>
<td>3,25 ±1,12</td>
<td>3,16 ±1,10</td>
<td>3,13 ±1,11</td>
<td>3,037*</td>
<td>Preschool&gt;Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>2,89 ±1,08</td>
<td>3,06 ±1,11</td>
<td>3,06 ±1,15</td>
<td>2,60 ±1,07</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inefficiency</td>
<td>3,14 ±.71</td>
<td>3,20 ±.78</td>
<td>3,18 ±.71</td>
<td>3,46 ±.76</td>
<td>3,037*</td>
<td>Preschool&gt;Basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,02 ±.60</td>
<td>3,17 ±.61</td>
<td>3,14 ±.69</td>
<td>3,07 ±.64</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived social</td>
<td>Family support</td>
<td>5,32 ±1,39</td>
<td>4,91 ±1,68</td>
<td>4,93 ±1,55</td>
<td>4,91 ±1,43</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support</td>
<td>Friend support</td>
<td>5,46 ±1,33</td>
<td>5,14 ±1,67</td>
<td>5,03 ±1,47</td>
<td>5,27 ±1,21</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special person sup.</td>
<td>4,59 ±2,12</td>
<td>4,35 ±2,39</td>
<td>3,88 ±2,27</td>
<td>4,31 ±2,03</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,12 ±1,21</td>
<td>4,80 ±1,59</td>
<td>4,61 ±1,40</td>
<td>4,83 ±1,35</td>
<td>2,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as mean±standard deviation. *p<0.05.

According to Table 7, academic burnout differs significantly according to the department of education (F=3.037, p<0.05). As a result of the Bonferroni test, it was shown that the students in the preschool department experienced more academic burnout than the students in the basic education department, and these showed a significant difference in terms of inefficiency. There was no significant difference in perceived social support levels between departments. The differences in resilience variable according to department is shown in Table 8.
Table 8. Kruskal Walls H-test values of resilience in terms of department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>Basic Education (n=106)</td>
<td>138,40</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Counseling (n=48)</td>
<td>159,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Teaching (n=65)</td>
<td>155,33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool Education (n=72)</td>
<td>139,96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data are presented as mean rank-sum of rank. *p<0.05.

According to table 8, no significant difference between departments was found in term of the variable of resilience. The results of the correlation analysis conducted to determine the relationships among the resilience, academic burnout and perceived social support levels of prospective teachers are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Correlation analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Perceived Social Support</th>
<th>Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.152**</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.152**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

According to Table 9, it is seen that there is a negative and low level relationship between teacher candidates' perceived social support and burnout levels. (r= -.152; p<.01). The hierarchical multiple analysis for exploring the effect of academic burnout on the relationship between resilience and perceived social support are demonstrated in Table 10.

Table 10. Regression analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>Standart Error</td>
<td>β</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Burnout</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>9,053</td>
<td>.007*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived Social Support</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>-2.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=.184 R²=.027 Sd:2/288 F: 5.060
*p<0.05
Table 10 shows that perceived social support contribute significantly to the explanation of variance, as it predicted academic burnout at $p>.05$. Perceived social support and resilience variables together explain approximately 3% of the total variance in burnout.

**Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendations**

In this study, besides examining the resilience levels, academic burnout and social support perceptions of teacher candidates according to various variables, it was tried to reveal the effect of students' social support perceptions and resilience on academic burnout during the pandemic process. Our results are summarized in the following.

Firstly, the results showed that the level of student burnout among students was not serious in general. A similar conclusion was reached in the study of Lin and Huang (2013). The highest level of academic burnout was obtained in the inefficiency subscale. This situation can be interpreted as prospective teachers feel academically inadequate because they had to conduct all their theoretical and practical courses online during the pandemic process.

Secondly, academic burnout significantly differed according to grade. In the sub-scale of academic inefficiency 1st and 2nd grade students get significantly higher scores than 3rd and 4th grade students. Similarly, it was concluded in the studies that the burnout levels of the 3rd and 4th grade students were higher than the 1st and 2nd grade students (Balkı et al., 2011; Guthrie et al., 1995; Guthrie et al., 1998; Güdüz et al., 2012; Kutsal & Bilge, 2012; Kütüküysleymanoğlu & Eğilmez, 2013; Ören & Türkoğlu, 2006; Seçer, 2015; Şentürk, 2016; Tansel, 2015). In addition to having more specialized and relatively more comprehensive courses in upper grades; It can be thought that students' burnout levels are high due to factors such as school completion, preparation for central exams and employment uncertainty. While interpreting the result that the burnout levels of upper-class students are high in this research, it is necessary to consider the factors that may affect the burnout level of students in the online education process. Many factors such as digital skills and knowledge deficiencies, financial inadequacies, family-related problems, and system-based technical problems can be counted among the factors that will affect students' burnout levels in the online education process. We can interpret the result that the burnout levels in the lower classes are higher in the dimension of inadequacy, with the feeling of academic inadequacy given by the university students' transition to the online education process without establishing a solid communication network with other students and educators, lacking the benefits of face-to-face education in the first steps of higher education.

Academic burnout differs significantly according to the department student’s study. It is seen that the academic burnout levels of the students in the preschool department are higher than the students in the basic education departments, and this differentiation is highest in the inefficiency sub-dimension. According to the findings obtained from Seçer (2015) and Ören & Türkoğlu’s (2016)
studies, the school burnout levels of the students of literature teaching and mathematics teaching departments were higher than the students of other departments. The longer undergraduate education period of these two departments can be interpreted as a reason why students experience more burnout.

In this research no significant difference between genders was found in terms of the variable of academic burnout. It is expected that the causes and results of academic burnout experienced by students during the online education process applied during the pandemic period and the causes and consequences of academic burnout in the face-to-face education process are different from each other. Different results were obtained for the determination of significant differences in the level of burnout by gender. While some of the studies emphasized that the level of burnout does not differ according to the gender variable (Breso et al, 2007; Guthrie, 1998; Kutsal & Bilge, 2012; Naçar et al. 2012; Ören and Türkoğlu, 2006; Santen, et al. 2010; Schorn & Buchwald, 2007; Sepehrmanesh et al, 2010; Tümkaya & Çavuşoğlu, 2010), another group of studies emphasize that the level of burnout is higher in female students (Çağatay İn & Şanlı Kula, 2019; Gündüz et al. 2012; Salmela-Aro et al., 2009) and another group of studies emphasize that the level of burnout is higher in male students (Tansel, 2015; Uludağ & Yaratan, 2010; Yang, 2004). In order to obtain clearer results regarding the gender variable, it is thought that conducting quantitative and qualitative research on different student groups in the online education process will further illuminate the subject.

In our study, it was concluded that the prospective teachers' perception of social support during the pandemic was moderate, and they received the most social support from their friends. According to our research, it is seen that the social support received from school or privately identified people before the pandemic was replaced by the social support received from friends during the pandemic period. In previous studies on social support, different results were obtained regarding friend support. In the study of Kutsal and Bilge (2012), it was determined that the support received from the teacher was more effective than the support received from family and friends in order to prevent students from experiencing burnout. There are also studies in the literature that support this result (Özer, Gençtanırım, & Ergene, 2011). It is a remarkable finding that in the study of Kutsal and Bilge (2012), the support of friends ranks third after teachers and family. Halbesleben (2006) concluded that work-related social support sources such as colleagues and managers are more closely related to the emotional exhaustion dimension of burnout, while non-work social support sources such as family and friends are more closely related to depersonalization and personal development dimensions. In Ho's (2016) study, perceived social support from family did not emerge as a significant mediator between humor and burnout components. Taylor et al.'s (2004) research also shows that social support from friends and family is used less in coping with stress. In the online education process, teachers should take their place as the first source from which students easily receive social support with online activities such as projects, competitions and interviews. School
management and teachers should improve themselves in this regard. The fact that the duty of teachers is not just to transfer information is a fact that maintains its validity in the online education process.

In our study, no significant difference was found between genders, classes and departments for the perceived social support variable. In studies on perceived social support, different results were obtained according to the gender variable. Iraz, et al. (2021) and Çeçen (2008) found that social support levels did not differ according to gender in their research; Rani (2016) states that women receive more social support than men and this support comes from family and friends and Talwar et al. (2013) found that women received more social support than men.

According to another research finding, it is seen that the resilience level of prospective teachers is moderate. And no significant difference between genders, grades and departments was found in terms of the variable of resilience. Similarly, there are studies that conclude that university students' levels of resilience do not differ according to gender (Arslan, 2019; Aydin & Egememberdiyeva, 2018; Chan, 2003; Crowley et al, 2003; Sezgin, 2009). Unlike these results, there are also studies showing that resilience may differ according to gender (Aydin, et al, 2019; Ergul, 2020; Hoşoğlu, et al, 2018; Sarwar, et al, 2010). Geyik Koç (2020) also concluded that the psychological resilience levels of female participants were found to be higher than male participants. On the other hand, Eker et al. (2020) concluded that male participants have a higher level of psychological resilience than female participants.

Individuals with a high level of resilience use more active and problem-focused strategies when faced with any problem situation and they prefer to use more active coping strategies such as problem solving and planning (Klag & Bradley, 2004). Individuals with high psychological resilience can take active steps to control stressful life events and consider such negative events as a kind of development and learning tool (Florian et al, 1995). In other words, psychological resilience functions to reduce the negative impact of any life event that can be evaluated as stressful or negative. In this case, carrying out studies to increase the psychological resilience levels of students during the pandemic period will improve the ability of students to cope with negative situations (Hanton et al, 2002).

Finally, it was concluded that there is a negative and low-level relationship between the social support perceived by the prospective teachers and their burnout levels. Similarly, in the study of Kutsal and Bilge (2012), it was concluded that students' burnout levels were predicted by their perceived social support. Also, Jacobs & Dodd’s (2003) study concludes that students with higher perceived social support experience lower levels of burnout.

In studies supporting this result, it has been reported that teachers who need social support are more prone to burnout symptoms than their other colleagues (Brouwers et al., 2001); It was stated that
teachers with high burnout levels received lower levels of social support from various sources (Burke and Greenglass 1993; Burke et al. 1996; Cheuk & Wong 1995).

Perceived social support significantly contributed to the explanation of the variance, as it predicted academic burnout at p>.05. Perceived social support and resilience variables together explain approximately 3% of the total variance in burnout. Although the variance rates explained by the variables are low, they are statistically significant. This finding is important in that it shows that there are other factors that affect prospective teachers' academic burnout, apart from the variables of resilience and perceived social support. In addition, there is a need for new studies on which variable or variables affect the burnout level of students in order to increase the effectiveness of the research results.

It is seen that there is a need for new studies that examine various factors and variables related to these factors to better understand academic burnout especially during the pandemic process. With new studies to be carried out in this direction, it will be possible to develop a broad perspective on academic burnout during the pandemic process. In order to increase the efficiency of online education processes, the application of which is becoming increasingly widespread, the online education process, which is applied in various times and forms in every country during the pandemic period, needs to be examined in detail.
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