

**MIGRANT ADULTS' REASONS OF NON-PARTICIPATION IN
ORGANIZED ADULT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES**

Thesis submitted to the Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

in Educational Sciences

by

Dilek ankaya

Boğaziçi University

2005

APPROVAL PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Many people contributed and assisted in this study. Without their support this study would have been impossible.

Primarily I am grateful to my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Rifat Okçabol for his sincere assistance, patience and limitless support during this study. He let me free in deciding in the subject of my choice, and he always tried to place me in track with realistic point of view. During my research assistantship in the Department of Educational Sciences, I learned how an academician should be from him; his diligence, both professional and personal ethics and honesty. I am very happy to have had the opportunity to work with him as my thesis advisor and as his research assistant.

I would like to thank my committee member and instructor, Prof. Dr. Fatma Gök. She was the one who motivated me to be interested in education during my undergraduate degree. Also, I decided to work on this subject inspired by a lesson I took from her. I really appreciate her support, her critical thinking and the richness of her knowledge and perceptions.

I also thank the other my committee member, Dr. Cem Kirazoğlu for his valuable suggestions about the implementation of the scale that he developed and the process of interview. He was always very patient and welcoming to my delay. I really appreciate him for his calmness and supportive contribution.

Prof. Dr. Güzver Yıldırım thought me research methods by a lesson I took from her; Prof. Dr. Ferhunde Özbay helped me broaden my vision about migration; and Assoc. Prof. İbrahim Sirkeci, who I contacted only by e-mail, sent me all his

articles about migration: I would like to thank them for the learning experience of how an academician should be acting to “inexperienced” researchers with solidarity.

My colleagues Selin Şen, Suna Eryiğit, Filiz Keser, Aylin Buran and Abuzer Yakaryılmaz did not only motivate, but also followed me throughout the thesis process; checking up on me, nagging me about working more efficiently. I had the opportunity to work with them in a very positive, supportive and joyful working environment. Also, we shared endless nights with Selin and Suna. I am very happy to have their valuable friendship.

My friend Deniz Şen was with me all days during interviews; he walked and talked so much. I should thank him for his unconditional support and calmness during the whole process of the study. I am also grateful to my friends Şeyda Havuş, Fatma Arslan, Abuzer Yakaryılmaz, Deniz Çankaya-Salmanlı, İzzet Şengel, Gökçe Güvercin, Burcu Kıranlar, Aysun Kuş, Reyhan Kuş, Ozan Seçkin, and Ziya Toprak for their helps during the data collection as interviewers. Şeyda, Fatma, my sister Deniz, and Abuzer did not only help me during data collection, but also provided support emotionally not to lose hopes and motivated me to continue the research. My friends, Onur Seçkin and Buket Saylık listened to me through endless nights, trying to show me different perspectives and keeping me company during the study, and Ozan Seçkin and Meral Apak helped me with English grammar and spelling check. Again, I should thank all my friends who showed me the real meaning of friendship and the importance of sharing difficult and joyful times together.

Being a well educated woman in this country is a kind of privilege. My family who migrated to a metropolitan city from their hometown in order to provide their children with more educational opportunities gave me this chance. I hope that they are proud of me. I appreciate their support; my father İsmet, my mother Selviye,

my elder sister Deniz and my brother Hasan. I should thank my “old and fat” runaway cat, Duman, to come back to home during the writing of this thesis.

I am deeply grateful to all the migrants who took part in this study. Without their co-operation and willingness to share their experiences and views, carrying out the study would not have been possible. I hope they will acquire their educational, social and economical rights one day. This thesis is dedicated to those beautiful days...

ABSTRACT

Migrant Adults' Reasons of Non-participation in Organized Adult Education

Activities

by

Dilek ankaya

In this study, migrant adults who migrated to İstanbul between 1985 and 2004, their non-formal and/or informal learning experiences, their reasons of non-participation in organized adult education activities and the relationship between migrants' characteristics and reasons of non-participation were investigated.

The sample of the study constitute by 202 adults who were residents of Kağıthane's four neighborhoods. The data was collected by an interview using an instrument including Reasons for Non-participation Scale (RENOPAS) developed by Kirazođlu (1996) and questions related with the demographic characteristics of the subjects.

Some of the migrants defined their non-formal and/or informal learning experiences. These learning areas were categorized and named as job related learning, religious belief, skills related with women, socialization, city life, political awareness, Turkish language, learning on their own, and others.

As a result of the factor analysis, the reasons of non-participation in educational activities of migrants (factors) were named as, low self-confidence, negative attitudes toward education, financial and communicational barriers, time constraints, family responsibility and familiarity with the courses, fear and hesitation regarding the environment, dissatisfaction from education, and unwillingness to participate.

There were significant relationship between the factors related with the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities and migrants' demographic characteristics in different levels. There were significant differences on the factors related with gender, age, marital status, education level, occupation, house ownership, perceived financial status and SES, migration reasons, and learning experiences. However, there were no statistically significant differences on the factors related with the place of birth and migration time.

Finding of the study indicate that migrant adults in İstanbul are deprived in different aspects and their needs are not satisfied properly by public adult education institutions. However, adults create their own learning areas by using different kind of sources.

ÖZET

Göç Etmiş Yetişkinlerin Eğitim Kurumlarının Yürüttüğü Yetişkin Eğitimi

Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri

Dilek Çankaya

Bu araştırmada, İstanbul'a 1985-2004 yılları arasında göç etmiş yetişkinlerin, eğitim kurumların yürüttüğü yetişkin eğitimi etkinliklerine katılmama nedenleri, yaygın (non-formal) ve/ya kendiliğinden (informal) öğrenme deneyim alanları ve yetişkin eğitimi etkinliklerine katılmama nedenlerinin nüfusbilim özellikleri ile ilişkisi araştırılmıştır.

Bu çalışmanın örneklemini 2005 yılında İstanbul'un Kağıthane ilçesinin dört mahallesinde oturan 202 göç etmiş yetişkin oluşturmuştur. Araştırma verileri, Kirazoğlu (1996) tarafından geliştirilen "Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri Ölçeği" ile deneklerin nüfusbilim özelliklerine yönelik soruların bulunduğu bilgi formu kullanılarak görüşmelerle toplanmıştır.

Faktör analizi sonucunda göç etmiş yetişkinlerin eğitim etkinliklerine katılmama nedenleri (faktörler), düşük öz-güven, eğitim etkinliklerine karşı olumsuz tutum, maddi ve iletişimsel engeller, zaman kısıtlılığı, aile sorumluluğu ve kurslara tanışıklık, çevreden çekinme- korku, kurslardan memnuniyetsizlik, katılmaya isteksizlik olarak adlandırılmıştır.

Göç etmiş yetişkinlerin bir kısmı, çeşitli örgün (formal) olmayan öğrenme deneyimleri tanımlamıştır. Bu öğrenme alanları gruplandırılarak, işle, dini inançla ilgili, kadınlara özgüleşmiş öğrenme, sosyalleşme, kent yaşamı, politik bilinçlenme, Türkçe, kendi kendine öğrenme ve diğerleri olarak adlandırılmıştır.

Nüfusbilim özelliklerin bir kısmı ile yetişkin eğitimi etkinliklerine katılmama nedenleri olan faktörler arasında değişik düzeylerde ilişki bulunmuştur. Toplumsal cinsiyet, yaş, medeni durum, eğitim düzeyi, meslek, ev sahipliği, algılanan ekonomik ve sosyo-ekonomik statü, göç etme nedenleri ve örgün olmayan öğrenme deneyimine sahip olma durumları ile faktörler arasında değişik düzeylerde anlamlı ilişki gözlemlenmiştir. Buna karşılık, göç etmiş yetişkinlerin doğdukları bölge ve göç etme tarihleri hiçbir faktör ile ilişkili çıkmamıştır.

Araştırma sonuçları, İstanbul'a göç etmiş yetişkinlerin pek çok açıdan yoksunluk içinde olduklarını ve devlete ait yetişkin eğitimi kurumlarının da onların gereksinimlerine yeterince yanıt vermediğini göstermektedir. Buna karşılık, yetişkinlerin kendi öğrenme alanlarını bazı kaynaklar kullanarak yarattıkları söylenebilir.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u> <u>Number</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	vi
ÖZET	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Introduction to the Problem	2
1.2. Statement of the Purpose	5
1.3. Definitions of the Terms	5
1.4. Research Questions of the Study	6
1.5. Significance of the Study	6
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	7
2.1. Adult Education	7
2.1.1. Adult Learning	9
2.1.2. Participation and Non-participation in Organized Adult Education	11
2.1.3. Participation and Non-participation in Organized Adult Education Activities in Turkey	14
2.2. Migration	18
2.2.1. Migration and Turkey	20
2.2.2. Squatter Settlement in Turkey	25
2.2.3. Istanbul and Migration	27
3. METHODOLOGY	29
3.1. Population and Sample Selection	29
3.2. Data Collection Instruments	31
3.3. Procedures	33
3.4. Analysis of Data	33

4.	FINDINGS	35
4.1.	Demographic Findings	35
4.2.	Learning Experiences	42
4.3.	Results of the Implementation of RENOPAS	48
4.3.1.	Factor Contents	49
4.3.2.	The Effect of Demographic Characteristics on the Factors	55
5.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	68
5.1.	Summary and Discussion	68
5.1.1.	Demographic Characteristics	69
5.1.2.	Learning Experiences	71
5.1.3.	Reasons of Non-participation	75
5.2.	Conclusion	81
5.3.	Limitations of the Study	82
5.4.	Recommendations for Further Researches	83
6.	REREFENCES	85
7.	APPENDIXES	92
A.	Reasons for Non-participation Scale (RENOPAS) with the Demographic Information Form of Current Research	92
B.	Additional Demographic Information About the Sample	98
C.	Rotated Factor Matrix of 16 Factors	102
D.	Extracted Factor Matrix of 8 Factors	106
E.	Content Comparisons of Between Factors Finding of Kirazoğlu and Current Study	109
F.	Mean and Standard Deviation of the Items in the RENOPAS	112

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
2. 1. City and Village Population 1927-1950	21
2. 2. City and Village Population 1955-1980	23
2. 3. City and Village Population 1985-2000	25
2. 4. Highest population and annual growth within sub-provinces of İstanbul (1985-1990)	28
3. 1. Distribution of the sample by neighborhood	33
4. 1. The subjects' age groups by gender	36
4. 2. The subjects' marital status by gender	36
4. 3. The subjects' number of children by marital status	37
4. 4. The subjects' educational level by gender	37
4. 5. The subjects' occupational status by gender	38
4. 6. The subjects' spouses' occupational status by gender	39
4. 7. The house ownership	39
4. 8. The subjects' perceived family financial status by gender	40
4. 9. The subjects' perceived SES by gender	40
4.10. The subjects' place of birth by gender	41
4.11. The subjects' reasons for migration	42
4.12. Migration time of the subjects by gender	42
4.13. Demographic characteristics of respondents of non-formal and/or informal learning	43
4.14. Gender and learning	46
4.15. Age group and learning	47
4.16. Educational level and learning	48
4.17. The items in the factor of low self-confidence	50
4.18. The items in the factor of negative attitudes toward education	51
4.19. The items in the factor of financial and communicational barriers	52
4.20. The items in the factor of time constraints	52
4.21. The items in the factor of family responsibility and familiarity with the courses	53
4.22. The items in the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment	54

4.23. The items in the factor of dissatisfaction from educational activities	54
4.24. The items in the factor of unwillingness to participate	54
4.25. t-test results for the factors by gender	55
4.26. One-way ANOVA results for on the factors by the age groups	56
4.27. t-test results for the factors by marital status	57
4.28. One- way ANOVA test for the factors by the number of children	58
4.29. One- way ANOVA results for the factors by the educational level	60
4.30. One- way ANOVA results for the factors by occupational status	62
4.31. t-test results for the factors by house ownership	62
4.32. One- way ANOVA results for the factors by perceived financial status	63
4.33. One- way ANOVA results for the factors by perceived SES	64
4.34. One-way ANOVA for the place of birth on the factors	65
4.35. One-way ANOVA for the factors by the reasons of migration	66
4.36. One-way ANOVA for the factors by migration time	67
4.37. t-test results for the respondents of non-formal and/or informal learning on the factors	67

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the missions of adult education is to help people learn new roles or improve their role performance in the society. However, participation in either formal or non-formal adult education programs is still low in the world among adults, especially by disadvantaged groups, such as poor, uneducated, disabled people. For this reason, studies related to the issues of participation and non-participation in adult education gain special importance especially to identify the reasons of participation or non-participation in adult education activities.

The migrants are one of the most important groups who need adult education in Turkey. There are many studies indicating that migrants who are uneducated, unqualified and constitute close to half of the urban population, are not participating in formal and adult education activities in general. However, migrants are not participating in organized adult education activities; rather may have different kinds of informal learning experiences.

In this first chapter, introduction to the problem, statement of the purpose, research questions of the study, significance of the study is presented. In the second chapter, the related literature is presented mainly in two parts, namely adult education with focus on participation and non-participation in organized adult education activities and non-formal/informal learning; migration with focus on internal migration. In the third chapter, research method is presented with the population and sample selection, data collection instruments, the procedure of the study, and data analysis. Findings of the study are presented in the fourth chapter. Summary of the findings and discussion, conclusion, limitations, and some recommendations for further research is included in the last chapter.

1.1. Introduction to the Problem

Population indicators and educational level of a society reflects the developmental level of a society. Population and education are interconnected phenomenon; they affect each other mutually (Sezal, 2001). Population movement and internal migration are very important concepts especially for developing countries. For example, after World War II, in 1950, 25 percent of Turkish population was living in the urban areas, nowadays; this rate is increased to 64.9 percent (DİE, 2000). This major change in Turkish society is manifested most visibly in the growth in size and number of urban places, and redistribution of population in the country. A number of serious problems arise because of the high level of urbanization that may be summarized as infrastructure problems, social problems, housing problems, transportation problems, insufficient labor demand to absorb the agrarian migrants in non-agrarian jobs and other problems. Thus, inevitably, there are many non-qualified and unemployed workers in urban centers (Ünlühisarcıklı, 1999).

Also, like urbanization, educational level of Turkish society has increased after establishment of Republic as well. In 1935, among the school aged children 75 percent of the urban population and 25 percent of the rural population registered a formal school (Çağlar, 1999) and most of the population was living in villages (76.5%). According to 1990 census, 80.5 percent of the population above the age of 6 was literate; in terms of literacy. At the same time, there was a discrepancy according to gender; females and males literacy rate were respectively 72.0 and 88.8 percent and nearly half of the literate population had not attended any formal school (Altunya, 1999), and primary and secondary education percentages were 87.2 and 40.1 respectively. According to UNDP report (1996), educational background level

of Turkey's total labor force was 78.1 percent primary education graduate or less, 7 percent junior high school graduate, 9.7 percent high school graduate, and 5.2 percent university graduate. In 2000, literacy rates for age 6 and above were 87.3 percent, and there was still a gap in literacy rates between males (93.9%) and females (80.6%), which was further apart in the rural areas. The enrolment rate of compulsory primary education was lower than the overall average in South Eastern Anatolia (74.6%), Eastern Anatolia (75.8%) and Black Sea region (86.4%). Similarly, general enrollment rate of secondary education level of South Eastern Anatolia (21.0%), Eastern Anatolia (26.7%), Black Sea (32.8%), and Mediterranean region (38.5%) were below the overall average (cited in Altunya, 1999).

These less educated and unqualified people from different regions were moved to big cities. Highest net in migration was towards İstanbul (108 ‰) and Kocaeli (108‰), followed by Antalya (90‰), İçel (68‰) and İzmir (64‰) between 1985 and 1990. However, some cities like Kars (-4‰), Tunceli (-154‰), Siirt (-141‰), Gümüşhane (-135‰), and Bayburt (-133‰) lost their population in 1990. The proportion of in-migrants within the total population of İstanbul was 15.5 (DİE, 1997). The 2000 census shows that, 4,111,355 people out of 10,018,735 people living in İstanbul, was born outside of İstanbul. It means 41.0 percent of the city population migrated to İstanbul (DİE, 2000).

The migrants who are ex-peasants in the cities deserve special attention as they constitute close to half of the urban population in cities. Urbanization and becoming urbanized have been defined by the United Nations as "Urbanization means the concentration of population in a particular area, becoming urbanized signifies the process by which the individual city-dweller adopts urban values, makes use of the opportunities offered by the urban environment, and is integrated in the

urban way of life” (United Nations, 1996, p.22-23). However, in cities, migrants have not been able to integrated to the social network; they were engaged in marginal, informal sectors which did not require education and skill, their income was very low. Limited income also did not give much chance to transform their lifestyle for becoming urbanized (Kıray & Abadan-Unat, 1985). They feel alone in cities, and need to protect their cultural identity. These needs create fellow townman (hemşehri) organizations that define a culture of “us” and “the others” (Bal, 1997, Çiftçi-Yeşiltuna, 1997). Generally, migrants who are from same village or region live in the same streets in order to protect themselves from the threat of cities’ heterogenous and large population and functions as an informal control mechanism especially on women to prevent a change in their religiously defined rural gender roles (Erman, 1998).

According the findings of the study carried out by Güner-Alkış (1988), in the process of urbanization, adults living in squatter settlements have individual as well as social needs for education. More than half of the adults imply that they are interested in taking part in education; moreover it can be said that those adults who are not interested in participating educational activities they encounter various barriers. Furthermore, it has been understood that they are not fully aware of educational opportunities (cited in Güner-Alkış, 1993). The unqualified and uneducated ex-peasant migrants need to be educated for adjustment of new life conditions (Kabadayı, 1997). One of the missions of adult education process is to facilitate adults to adjust to their new life conditions and to increase the educational level of the society.

But, 1990 census results show that only 7.12 percent of the adult population had participated in some private or state institutes’ adult education activities (DİE,

1993), and in 2004, only about 3 million adults are attending public or/and private adult education programs (MEB, 2004). Participants in adult education activities are well educated, had an above average income, and lived in urban areas. That means underprivileged population who are less educated, illiterate, living in rural or squatter settlements areas, married women, elderly and handicapped can not make use of the benefits of adult education (Okçabol, 1996).

Migrant adults, who have not participated in organized adult education activities, might have non-formal and informal learning experiences in their social networks and work places, and these learning experiences can help them to adjust to new conditions as well as may isolate them from the urban life. Present study would be helpful to identify their informal learning experiences and their thoughts about these experiences.

1.2. Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore reasons of non-participation in organized adult education activities of migrant adults, their non-formal and/or informal learning experiences, and to explain the relationship between migrants' characteristics and to their reasons of non-participation.

1.3. Definitions of the Terms

The followings are the definitions of some of the terms used in this study:
Organized adult education activities take place in public or private education, and training institutions for adults.

Non-formal education refers to all educational activities, programs that take place outside the formal school system and public or private education, and training institutions.

Informal learning takes place outside the curricula provided by formal and non-formal educational institutions and programs.

1.4. Research Questions of the Study

In this study answers were sought for the following research questions:

1. What are the major factors that effect migrants' non-participation in organized adult education activities?
2. What are the types of non-formal and/or informal learning experiences of migrant adults?
3. Is there any relationship between selected demographic characteristics and non-participation in organized adult education activities of migrant adults? Selected demographic variables are: gender, age, marital status, number of children, educational level, occupational status of the non-participant and his/her spouse, house ownership, perceived family financial status, and perceived SES, place of birth/origin, reasons of migration, migration date to İstanbul.

1.5. Significance of the Study

In Turkey, researchers are generally interested in organized adult education activities and in these researches duration of urbanization is questioned in relation to the demographic variables. But there are very few researches done about non-formal and/or informal learning experiences of non-participants and migrants' reasons of non-participation in adult education activities. This research may enrich the related

literature and to help promoting effective educational programs for a disadvantaged group, namely migrants, by identifying the reasons of non-participation in adult education.

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

The literature review includes two main parts, namely adult education which is subdivided as formal, non-formal and informal learning, participation and non-participation in organized adult education activities in general and in Turkey; and migration with focus on internal migration within Turkey.

2.1. Adult Education

Adult education term includes two different concepts: adulthood and education. Although there is no universally accepted definition for adulthood, Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) define adults as “persons who have completed or left school or collage and are no longer full-time students are considered adults on the grounds that they have assumed the productive social roles that characterize adult status” (p.8). Education, which derives from the Latin verb (*educere*) meaning “to lead forth”, encompasses forms of learning characterized by the presence of a instructor, someone presumed to have greater knowledge, and a learner or learners presumed to have lesser knowledge and expected to be instructed or led by said instructor.

Adult education is defined in different contexts. In broadest sense, the term describes a process of adult learning; technically it describes a set of organized activities carried on by a variety of institutions for the specific objectives (Knowles, 1980). However, the most widely used definition of adult education is the definition of UNESCO. In *Terminology of Adult Education* (1979) a comprehensive definition is provided as:

“the term denotes entire body of organized educational process, whatever the content, level and method, whether formal or otherwise, whether they prolong

or replace initial education in schools, colleges and universities as well as in apprenticeship, whereby persons regarded as adult by society to which they belong develop their abilities, enrich their knowledge, improve their technical or professional qualifications or turn them in a direction and bring about changes in their attitudes or behavior in the twofold perspective of full personal development and participation in balanced and independent social, economic and cultural development” (UNESCO; 1979).

It is also important to differentiate education and learning. Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) emphasized the differences between education and learning and said that “all education surely involves learning, but not all learning involves education, and education is deliberate, systematic and sustained effort to transmit, evoke, or acquire knowledge, attitudes, values, or skills”. Longworth (2003, p.12) defined learning as:

“doing things in a different way, creating an out-and-out focus on the needs and demands of the learner; giving learners the tools and techniques with which they can learn according to their own learning styles and needs. It is not teaching, not training, and not even education in its narrow didactic sense. It has a much wider scope. It has a social, economical, politic, personal, cultural, and of course, educational meaning in its widest sense”.

2.1.1. Adult Learning

The needs of learning (and teaching) derive from personal needs such as psychological, having knowledge, retraining, and leisure; and societal necessities such as socialization, scientific and technological needs, protection from negative effects of globalization, democracy and secularity (Okçabol, 2005).

The European Commission’s memorandum on lifelong learning defines three basic categories of purposeful learning activity: formal, non-formal, and informal learning (cited in Longworth, 2003): formal learning, which is organized by professional educators with defined curriculum and takes place in education, and training institutions, leading to recognized diplomas and qualifications. Non-formal learning which takes place alongside the mainstream systems of education and

training with some sorts of systematic instruction. Non-formal learning may be provided by adult education institutions, in the workplace or through the organizations of non-governmental organizations (NGO) or civil society groups. Informal learning is defined as a natural accompaniment to everyday life either conscious or unconscious. However, there are some varieties in the definitions and types of informal learning. Foley (2004) defines informal learning as “conscious” attempt to learn from experiences in a group or individual base. Livingstone, Hart and Davie defines (2003, p. 47) informal learning as “all activities we engage in on our own or with others, outside of organized courses, to gain new knowledge or skills”, and informal learning takes place outside the curricula provided by formal and non-formal educational institutions and programs. Informal learning can take place in any place, such as the workplace, the family, a religious institution, the community and the like. Also, Freire’s (1970) reflections on collective learning through dialogue are perceived as a part of informal learning practice; and self-directed learning and dialogue have been used as a strategy to facilitate spiritual development (English, 2000). Involvement in informal learning activities are perceived as a tool for increased self-confidence, extended social networks, and increased knowledge about formal educational activities. Also, researchers give great importance both education and learning which give people political and economical voice in the society as a citizen (Gallacher, Crossan, Leahy, Merrill, & Field, 2000).

Learning is closely related to the way in which individuals develop in relation to their social and physical environment and it is effected, may even to some extent be controlled by society or other collectives (Rogers, 1996). Furthermore, unstructured characteristics of informal learning may be manipulated by different social groups. This implies that like formal and non-formal education and learning,

informal learning can be perceived as a part of political nature of educational process which reproduces the dominant ideology (Freire & Macedo, 1987). In individual level, this manipulation explained by Marsick and Watkins as:

“It is easy to become trapped by blind spots about one’s own needs, assumptions, and values that influence the way people frame a situation, and by misperceptions about one’s own responsibility when errors occur. When people learn in families, groups, workplaces, or other social settings, their interpretation of a situation and consequent actions are highly influenced by social and cultural norms of others. Yet, people often do not deeply question their own or others’ views. Power dynamics may distort the way in which they understand events. These issues make it imperative that we teach adult learners strategies to make this kind of learning both more visible and more rigorous” (2001, p.31).

2.1.2. Participation and Non-participation in Organized Adult Education

There is no single theory or model to explain or predict participation in adult education. There are number of models and studies, some emphasizing the psychological reasons and some emphasizing participation with social and environmental forces on the individual.

However, reasons for taking adult education courses are primarily related with job-related phenomenon, most of the participants mentioned that the reasons taking the courses was either to prepare for a new job or to help to do the current job better and researches show that lifelong learning has a positive effect on wages (Jenkins, Vignoles, Wolf & Galindo-Rueda, 2002).

The regions that people live in have an effect on participation as well as financial statuses. Johnstone and Rivera (1965) revealed that 85 percent of adults with high income living in middle size cities could say at least one source where they might get information and this rate declines to 19 percent of adults with low level of income living in rural areas (cited in Güner- Alkış, 1993).

People do not participate in organized adult education activities in general and different researches and theoreticians interested in non-participation reasons. Cross (1981) suggests a typology of barriers into three categories; situational, institutional and dispositional barriers. Situational barriers relate with learner's life situation; institutional constraints relate with institutions' features and dispositional barriers relate with the persons' self-perception and attitudes (cited in Gallacher & et al, 2000). Young (1999)'s definition of main impediments of learning have similarities with Cross's categorization. In this categorization, institutional, informational, financial, and motivational obstacles are main impediments for participation (cited in Gallacher & et al, 2000).

Darkewald and Merriam (1982) classified obstacles to participation into four general categories: institutional, informational, situational, and psychosocial. They explained institutional barriers as erected by learning institutions or agencies that exclude or discourage certain groups of learners because of such things as inconvenient schedules, full-time fees for part-time study, restricted locations, and like this. In addition to those, lack of attractive or appropriate courses, institutional policies and inappropriate implementations, practices can be characterized as institutional barriers. Informational barriers are mentioned fundamental obstacle with psychosocial barriers. It is not only institutional failure in informing people and also failure of people "particularly the least educated and poorest to seek out or use the information that is available" (Darkewald & Merriam, 1982; p.137). Situational barriers relate with the learners' life context, the realities of one's social and physical environment such as, cost, lack of time, lack of transportation, geographical isolation, lack of child care and home responsibilities especially for woman. Psychosocial barriers (more narrowly attitudinal or dispositional) are individuals'

beliefs, attitudes, values or perception that inhibit participation in organized learning activities such as perception of age, interest, experiences associated with the level of SES, and worth of education in the reference group (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982).

Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) identified similar reasons for non-participation in organized adult education programs with Darkenwald and Merriam (1982), lack of confidence, lack of course relevance, time constraints, low personal priority, cost and personal problems.

It is known that participation in adult education is very rare in older people and most of them are middle classes and those with higher levels of educational attainment. Negative experience of education in childhood, and lack of resources are some reasons and these are both cultural and socio-economic factors of non-participation in older ages (Jamieson, Miller, & Stafford, 1998).

Earlier negative school experiences can cause negative attitudes toward education and schooling. These attitudes and experiences can be seen as working class culture which is understood as “the others” in the society, that causes to develop negative attitudes to education and middle class institutions like schools (Willis, 1977) and O.Rourke (1995) identified that

“When educational disadvantage is compounded by other material differences - of gender, ethnicity, poverty, class, disability and sexuality - the effect is often a denial of imagined possibility. Too often education has already written these people off, and they internalize a belief that education is not for the likes of them” (cited in McGivney, 2001, p.39)

also each generation learns from previous generations; the ability to build on the human capital of one’s elders plays an important role in the growth generated by rising time spent in school (Bils & Klenow, 2000). This phenomenon indicates that negative attitudes toward education passes through generation.

One of the highest participation rates in organized educational activities is in Canada; however, there is a discrepancy according to economical status of participants and non-participants, 42 percent of the whole population reported taking a course in formal setting in 2001; lowest income generated respondents' participation rate is 27 percent, while the highest two categories report over 50 percent participation rate (Livingstone, Hart, & Davie, 2003). Moreover, financial constraints are one of the most important reasons for non-participation in educational activities mentioned above.

2.1.3. Participation and Non-participation in Organized Adult Education

Activities in Turkey

In everyday life, the terms of “people’s education”, “non-formal education”, and “adult education” are used as synonyms. National level, Regulation of Non-formal Education Institutions which is bounded to The Ministry of National Education (MONE) conducts and coordinates adult education activities, according to the Basic Law of National Education (acted in 1973 no: 1739). Regulation of Non-formal Education Institutions issued by the MONE defined non-formal education in 1979 as:

“Non-formal education is for individuals, who never attended formal education or have dropped it at any level. Non-formal education activities lie within or outside of formal education as lifelong teaching-learning, guidance, and applied programs with different duration and levels, which are organized according to individual’s interests, abilities, and desires for their social, cultural, and economic development (cited in Okçabol, 2001, p.2).

Public, private, and non-governmental organizations provides adult education activities include variety of activities which can be grouped as vocational, leisure-hobby types, literacy, driving courses, and socio-cultural activities. One of the most

widespread adult education institutions is People's Education Centers (PECs). There are 922 centers all around the Turkey which are bounded to Regulation of Non-formal Education Institutions. There is no available data either the number of private, in-service training institutions or their participants. It is because there are number of researches about participants of institutions which are bounded Regulation of Non-formal Education Institutions. According to data obtained from these institutions, majority of the participants are women except apprenticeship trainings, literacy, and driving courses. People who are high school or university graduates prefer private courses, and less educated group prefer public, free of charge courses. Illiterate or only literate population and people who are older than 44 years old do not attend courses in general who need adult education. Participants of Koran courses are generally primary school graduates (Okçabol, 2001). State Institute of Statistics' data show that the number of Koran courses and participants are increasing continuously. There were 48 courses and 1288 participants in 1960 and it is increased to 1562 courses and 65,465 participants in 1980, and to 4891 courses and 177,325 participants in 1995 (cited in Okçabol, 2001).

Ural (1993) adopted an instrument to investigate the reasons of adult learners for participating in organized adult education programs in Turkey. She found eight main reasons for participating in adult education programs, namely inner-directed learning, escape, learning for competition, social relations, other-directed learning, personal improvement, obedience to authority, and social and economic improvement. Also, she found that most of the participants of PECs are female, between 15 and 25 years old, single, primary school graduates, average income level, residing in İstanbul since birth. Going to school, working, lack of information, child

rearing, and lack of interest are frequently stated reasons for not participating in any adult education programs before.

Akgüner (1994) assess the attitudes of participants' demographic characteristics in different PECs. She found that females, university graduates, adults who born in İstanbul or other cities, singles, housewives, adults from low income level seem to have more positive attitudes.

Kirazoğlu (1996) developed a scale to assess the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities. The Reasons for Non-Participation Scale (RENOPAS) is the unique instrument which assess reasons of non-participation in adult education activities. The instrument is found to be highly reliable (Cronbach alpha is .9323), and valid. Factor analysis and judges classification carried out for the construct validity of the instrument. The factors are financial constraints, negative attitudes toward educational activities, time constraints, fear and hesitation regarding the environment, low self-confidence, communicational barriers, family responsibility and institutional barriers. Kirazoğlu found that most influential demographic characteristics were age, which is related to six factors. Educational level, marital status, number of children, occupational status, spouses' occupational status, and perceived family status associated with five factors, then gender related with three factors as one of the most influential demographic characteristics. Also, he found that the most important factor is financial constraints which influenced by different nine demographic characteristics, and least important factors is negative attitudes towards educational activities and institutional barriers which are affected by two demographic characteristics. The years of residence in İstanbul do not have any significant effect on the factors.

Also, Güner- Alkış (1993) found that there is no statistically significant relationship between the years of residence in İstanbul and participation in adult education activities, especially vocational trainings. However, there is a significant relationship between years of residence in İstanbul and formal level of education of squatter settlement residents. Residents who find themselves in the best situation in the terms of level of education are who stay in the cities for duration of between 11-30 years.

Problems of residents of squatter houses, who are generally migrants, necessitate that they develop new behaviors (knowledge, skill, and attitude) and style of living and these encounter as “the needs of education”. Squatter settlements’ residents are neglected masses and they are the segment of the population whose needs of education should be met (Güner- Alkış, 1993).

Ünlühisarcıklı, Kirazoğlu and Okçabol, (1994) found that most of the migrants (67%) do not have any out-of-school learning experiences. Most frequently stated reasons for non-participation are no desire to participate (43%), financial constraints (30%), childcare (17%), and unpermissive husband (5%). However, migrants mentioned some difficulties when they moved to İstanbul. They stated different kinds of activities can help them to overcome these difficulties: information about the place, opportunities and sources of the new region (28%), job related learning activities (24%), cultural adaptation activities (16%).

Sociology Association carried out a research in different squatter settlement regions (n=2021) in different cities of Turkey in 1993. This research indicates that educational level of people who are living in squatter settlement regions, are 19.8 percent illiterate, 12.5 percent literate, 46.1 percent graduated from primary school, 11.1 percent graduated from secondary schools, 8.6 percent graduated from high

schools, and only 1.8 percent graduated from higher education. In addition to that, 84 percent of the residents of squatter settlement regions had not participated in any organized adult education activities (Sosyoloji Derneği, 1993) and nearly half of the participants of any courses the range of 12 and 19 age group was participants of Koran courses (45.7%). Especially older group who did not participate Koran courses, motivate their children to participate in Koran courses, which implies religious education increase in city life. Similarly, Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001) found that 35 percent of adults take part in one of adult education activities in Sultanbeyli, İstanbul, and nearly 50 percent of participants of any kind of course take part in Koran Courses.

2.2. Migration

This part will provide theoretical background on definition of migration, reasons of migration and migration in Turkey, squatter settlement phenomenon and immigration to Istanbul. The concept of migration derives from the “Latin *migrare*, to change one residence, but by current definitions it means rather to change one’s community” (Petersen, 1968, p. 287) and “geographical movements of individuals or groups” (Richmond, p. 428).

Migration is often considered as a consequence of the development process as economies shift away from agricultural production and become more urbanized. Nowadays, it is assumed that internal migration is a livelihood strategy for the poor people, but the governments should take into consideration the migrants’ contribution to economy and provide them the adequate living conditions in the immigration regions (Deshingkar & Grimm, 2005). Beside this, unmanaged migration causes many problems: First of all, it is a demographic problem; it

influences sizes of populations at areas of origin and destination. It is an also economic problem: Major shifts in population have taken place due to economic imbalances between origin and destination. Furthermore, it is also a sociological problem since the social structure and cultural system of both the areas places of origin and of destination are affected by migration and in turn affect the migrants. Last but not the least, educational services also suffer under the conditions.

People move because of many reasons. According to Lee (cited in Najjar, 1976) for every decision to migrate there will be positive and negative factors associated with the place of origin, and with the place of destination, intervening obstacles, -such as ethnic barriers, distance and social class-, and personal factors. Related to this, there is a traditional approach of studying migration which is based on pull-push factors theory. The general claim of this theory is that the socio-economical imbalances between the area of origin and destination cause migration. The push factors are related with the negative characteristics of the origin (generally less urbanized areas), that the migrants were born in, such as insufficient and infertile land for cultivation and the absence of work opportunities. The pulling factors are related with the destination; the urbanization and its opportunities for occupation, education and general life standards of urban areas. People migrate in order to work and earn money somewhere else, because they perceive it to be to their advantage; they expect to gain, or to avoid loss or getting away from staying in the places where they were born.

The theory of the determinants of migration goes back to 1880s when Ravenstein (1889) proposed his “laws of migration”. According to these laws, migrants’ choices of destination are regulated by distance, they tend to go short distances, and they prefer major centers of recommence and industry. Migrants tend

to move first toward nearby towns and eventually move to most rapidly growing cities. Nowadays, especially poorer people move shorter distances because of their limited sources (Deshingkar & Grimm, 2005).

2.2.1. Migration and Turkey

Turkey's demographic structure was constructed mainly by migration in, out and within the Anatolia during especially 20th century (Zarakoğlu, 2000, İçduygu & Sirkeci, 1999). Since, founding of Turkish Republic in 1923, migration has been multifaceted effect on the country. The internal migration process in Turkey has captured different migratory trends in it. There are multiple forms of internal migration like interregional seasonal migration from rural to urban places; seasonal rural to rural migration; migration from urban to urban; migration from urban to rural and particularly after the late 1980s the forced migration from eastern parts of the country (İçduygu & Ünalın, 1997). It is also possible to observe changing forms of migration in different historical stages of economic and political development in Turkey. Migration history of Turkish Republic has been divided into different periods by researchers. İçduygu and Sirkeci (1999) states four main periods based on the problematic stages of the internal migration; namely, 1923-1950, 1950's-1960's, 1960-1970-1980's and after 1980's. And Özbay and Yücel (2001) have been divided into mainly three periods: 1923-1950 forced migration, 1950-1980 labor migration, after 1980 global and local transformations. In this research, Turkish migration history will be divided into mainly these three periods with some important migratory movements.

1923-1950. In that period, the migration can be characterized as political displacement. Clearly the aspect of force is a matter of degree proposes to regard forced migration as migration under duress.

After World War I and War of Independence, large populations of Turkish national citizens and Muslims were living outside the national borders of Turkish Republic migrated an in and out (and also within) after formation of the national state. After Lausanne Treaty (July 23rd, 1923), between 1923 and 1925, 500 thousands Muslims and about 1 million Orthodox Greeks were exchanged (Arı, 1999). “It appears to be generally accepted now that most of the forced displacement which has taken place in history is closely linked to the emergence of the nation state” (Kuhlman, 2000, p.5).

Around 1930s, there has been some anti-regime movements taking place in the eastern part of the country and 55 tribes, most of which were Kurdish people, were forced to migrate to different parts of Turkey (Değirmen, 2000). Also, there were some internal and international migration taking place in that period but these were not a great effect on population distribution of the country. Percentages of urban population in 1927 (the first census), 24.2 percent and in 1950, 25.0 percent was living in the urban cities. Growth in the proportion of urbanized areas and variation in the rate of urbanization in Turkey are shown in the Table 2.1. The rate of urbanization was low initially (1927-1950), increased sharply after 1950 census. The rapid urbanization in Turkey is characterized by moderately rapid population growth in general, due to a decline in death rates which took place chiefly after 1945 and migration from rural to urban areas.

Table 2.1. *City and Village Population 1927-1950*

<i>Census Year</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Village</i>	<i>%</i>
1927	13648270	3305879	24.2	10342391	75.8
1935	16158018	3802642	23.5	12355376	76.5
1940	17820950	4346249	24.4	13474701	75.6
1945	18790174	4687102	24.9	14130072	75.1
1950	20947188	5244337	25.0	15702851	75.0

Source: DİE, 1993

1950-1980. From 1950s to 1980s, migration was caused by economical reasons. The changes in the world after World War II, changes in economic conditions from agricultural based society to more industrialized society in Turkey, and rapid increase of population in rural areas were some basic causes of internal migration. Internal migration has played a very important role in Turkey's economy. It has affected not only the development of industry and the growth of capitalism but also caused an increase in social stratification and a decline in agriculture and changed the government's economical policy as well. Up to the 1950s the main body of the population was still peasant and living in rural areas (see, Table 2.1-2.2; 75% in 1950 and 56.1 in 1980). Kıray and Abadan-Unat (1985, p. 496-497) mentioned that: "The words *The People* meant peasants living in isolated, self-sufficient villages with their extended families and kin relations, their plow and ox, and their fatalistic muslim and practical, folk-belief system".

After the World War II, USA Aid that carried out in the frame of Marshall Plan steered to the countries that called "Third World" beginning from first half of the 1950s. Concerning the agreement that includes particularly purchase of tractors, a sociologist from USA who had lived in Turkey said "If Marshall Plan tractor machines force peasants to move to the cities, I could not think about that how lived be there. If rapid agricultural mechanization does not go in collaboration with rapid industrialization, this brings destruction for the people who snapped off from fields

and do not have any other employment opportunity” (cited in Köymen, 1999, p. 17-18). After a great increase of tractor usage in the agriculture (9905 in 1950, 31,415 in 1952, 118,825 in 1971) (cited in Köymen, 1999) small land owners left agriculture and landless families increased from 9.1 percent in 1963 to 21.9 percent 1973 (Kongar, 1976). Those who could not remain in agriculture, even as a wage worker, migrated to the cities. In the 1950s and 1960s, most migrants in the city had strong links with their villages. Usually the male members of the households migrated to city while leaving the women and children back in the village. After 1960s other family members has migrated to cities (Özbay, 1999). In that period of time not only internal but also international migration rate increased (Özbay & Yücel, 2001; Akgür, 1997).

Table 2.2. *City and Village Population 1955-1980*

<i>Census Year</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Village</i>	<i>%</i>
1955	24064763	6927343	28.8	17137420	71.2
1960	27754820	8859731	31.9	18897089	68.1
1965	31391421	10805817	34.4	20585604	65.6
1970	35605176	13619101	38.3	21914075	61.6
1975	40347719	16869068	41.8	23478651	58.2
1980	44736957	19647007	43.9	25091950	56.1

Source: DİE, 1993

After 1945, virtually all countries in Western Europe began to attract significant numbers of workers from abroad (Massey, Arango, Kouaouci, Taylor, 1993). Some countries established labor recruitments with these countries, and one of the labor exporter countries was Turkey. A mass migration from Turkey to European countries took place after that labor recruitment agreement with several Western European countries in the early 1960. After 1973 (these recruitments were stopped, because of economic crises in the Europe), instead of labor migration, family reunification migrations occurred in these countries (Özbay & Yücel, 2001; Sirkeci,

2002; Kadioğlu, 1997). Turkish emigration was not only the direction of Western Europe, “when the labor export opportunities ended in Western Europe new destinations appeared as Australia and Arab countries. Nowadays, totally about 3 million Turkish national people are living outside” (Sirkeci, 2002: p.12).

Between 1977 and 1979, Turkey had an economic and social crisis. In this period there had been queues for the goods ranging from cooking oil to gasoline; common prices increased 53 percent in 1978 and 64 percent in 1979. Already the years following 1976 had been the years when the relative prices turn versus agriculture, in favor of industry, there was an increasing trend of poverty in rural areas (Boratav, 2000).

After 1980s. In 1980, liberal economy policies were established and basic characteristics of Turkey (like most of developing countries) were became economic globalization and neo-liberal economy policies, nearly two million people were unemployed in that period (İçduygu & Sirkeci, 1999, Boratav, 2000). The reasons of migration became more complicated in that period: socio-cultural, economical, and political reasons. Nearly 350 thousand people migrated to west Europe as a politically motivated refugee between 1980 and 1995, first, because of military coup of September, 12, 1980 and then Kurdish ethnic revival (İçduygu & Sirkeci, 1999). After the late 1980s the forced migration from Eastern parts of the country caused another flow of migration. There is no significant population data about forced displacement; but one of the governor of the region declared 2,785 small settlement places were totally or partially evacuated (Milliyet Newspaper, 1996, 27th May, p.6)

Until 1985, more than half of the population in Turkey was living in rural areas (Table 2.3, in 1985: 47.0%) and social structure of rural area is characterized as poor, under populated peasant life (Kıray & Abadan-Unat, 1985). These were

pushing factors for the people who were living those areas. After 1985, urban centers became densely populated not because of high birth rates in cities, but because of massive exodus from these rural areas and other small cities.

Also, two important economical crises (1994 and 2001) affected the whole society especially poor people and middle class. By these crises, sharing the gross national product has changed against majority, and in favor of the rich minority (Sönmez, 2002, Boratav, 2000a).

Table 2.3. *City and Village Population 1985-2000*

<i>Census Year</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Village</i>	<i>%</i>
1985	50664458	26865757	53.0	23798701	47.0
1990	56473035	33326351	59.0	23146684	41.0
2000	67803927	44006274	64.9	23797653	35.1

Sources: DİE, 1993 and 2000

In Turkey because of that there is no policies aimed to solve the problems of migrants or institutional regulations, migrants try to solve the problems regarding their basic rights with relatives who migrated before they arrive and they try to solve the problems regarding their adaptation to the cities by family institute that has protective function and religious institute that they know from rural areas. However, attributes of people who migrated after 1980 and change undergoing about their style of assessment of their productive roles enhanced the communication in a different sense, on the other hand beside adjustment process this gives opportunity to urban tension” (Peker, 1999).

2.2.2. Squatter Settlement in Turkey

The most important consequence of this rapid internal migration as households- in a context where the speed of industrialization was relatively low- is

the beginning of squatter settlements (gecekondu) process in big cities of the country. “Gecekondu” is a Turkish concept meaning “built overnight”. It is officially defined as a house built in a very short time on state or privately owned land without permission and with the efforts of migrants themselves. Since the 1950s with different objectives, several squatter settlement amnesty laws have been established. Most of the time these objectives are set as part of vote seeking political agendas, which further enhance rural-to-urban migration (Sönmez, 1996, Keleş, 1982).

The development of squatter settlements shows difference in different periods of time. Keleş (1993) identifies this phenomenon in three periods. Until 1960s they were places where the sheltering needs of poor families were met and places that they constructed in their own possibilities, between 1960-1970 squatter houses again were being constructed with labor of the owners but the rate of renting increased, that is to say the owner’s squatter houses constructed excessive amount of house that they needed. After 1980 companies that construct and sell squatter settlements emerged. The share of squatter settlements reached to the same levels among houses for rent. Therefore, squatter settlement regions are not economically or socially homogenous yet (Erder, 1996).

About half of the housing premises in large cities are unlicensed or illegal squatter constructions. People came to the cities because of urbanization and its opportunities for occupation, education and general life standards of urban areas. The rate of population growth in cities far exceeds job creation, leading to more unemployment and worsening poverty. World Resources Institute Report for 1996 show that the opportunities of the cities cannot be used by people who are living below the poverty level (cited in Tatlıdil, 1997). It is also important to notice that especially after 1984 resident of squatter settlement regions could built more floors

over their houses, that increase the rate of the owning another house. First and second generation of migrant could increase their life standards but the comers of the city are turned over their poverty; and it shows the “poverty by turns” characteristic of the squatter settlement (Işık & Pınarcıoğlu, 2001).

In the areas of squatter houses, low rates of teacher-student in the level of basic education, crowdedness of schools, facts like double-triple education, squatter settlement children’ obligation of bringing money to home prevented education of squatter settlement house’s children in the quality that the cities demand. Since education and world horizon of migrants coming from rural areas and forced migrants at takeoff point does not include new searches at the beginning of migration, migrants do not question the city life. As the duration of stay extends, they question the place of themselves and children in the system, question their future, and gradually their level of content decreases. As they do not live as a city-dweller, they always think about their takeoff point, however since they know the return is impossible, they usually arm family and religious institution (Peker, 1999). Furthermore, Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001) found that narrowing of opportunities that education offers to the migrants and the low level of profit by education are the reasons for not to give importance to education in a squatter settlement region.

2.2.3. Istanbul and Migration

Istanbul is the one of the most affected city because of migration. The highest provincial in-migration between 1985 and 1990 was equal in Istanbul and Kocaeli. Permanent resident population of Istanbul in 1985 was 5,068,512; net migration rate in this year was 60 per thousand (net migration=in-out migration) and the proportion of in-migration within the total population of Istanbul was 5.7 percent. In 1990,

permanent resident population of Istanbul was 6,433,569, net migration rate was 108 per thousand and the proportion of in-migration within the total population of Istanbul was 15.5 (DİE, 1997) and half of the population migrated from Black Sea, East, South East, Middle Anatolia and Mediterranean regions (Özbay, 1999).

The highest population growth occurred in squatter settlement settlements in 1985-1990. The sub-provinces with the highest population growth were Kağıthane with 159.8 per thousand per year and Ümraniye with 142 per thousand (Table 5) and these sub-provinces were poorer than other sub-provinces which population growth rate was very low (Sönmez, 1996, Özbay 1999).

Table 2.4. *Highest population and annual growth within sub-provinces of İstanbul (1985-1990)*

<i>Sub-provinces</i>	<i>1985</i>	<i>1990</i>	<i>Annual growth rate ‰</i>
Kağıthane	120,996	269,042	159.8
Ümraniye	118,995	242,091	142
Büyükçekmece	11,310	22,394	136.6
Silivri	15,767	26,049	100
Pendik	182,205	289,380	95.5

Source: Sönmez, 1994

3. METHODOLOGY

This section is composed of a research design which includes the population and sample selection, data collection instruments, the procedure of the study, and the data analysis.

This is a descriptive survey type study which attempts to explore the non-formal and/or informal learning experiences, the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities of migrant adults and to explain the relationship between migrants' characteristics and their non-participation reasons.

3.1. Population and Sample Selection

Population of the study is the adults who were born outside of Istanbul in Turkey, headed household (financial supporter and/or main caregiver of the family), migrated to the city between 1985 and 2004, and have not participated in any organized adult education activities during their lifespan and are living in sub-provinces that are mostly squatter settlements. Adults who participated in the following organized adult education activities are not included in the population and sample:

- Courses offered by the People's Education Centers,
- Courses or any educational activity offered by any adult education institution bounded to the Ministry of National Education (MONE),
- Courses like computer, accounting, foreign language, etc. provided by private firms,
- In-service training activities provided by a foundation, municipality or association.

However, adults who have participated in the following educational activities are considered within the population:

- In university preparatory courses,
- In the courses where pregnant women attend,
- In short term seminars,
- In driver courses.

Population of the study is selected from the migrants who migrated between 1985 and 2004, because until 1985, more than half of the population of Turkey was living in rural areas (in 1985, 47.0%), and nowadays that shows a decrease of 35.1 percent. One of the most effected cities because of migration is İstanbul; between 1985 and 1990, in-migration within the total population of İstanbul had increased 9.8 percent. It is assumed that adaptation to city life and seeking for educational opportunities take at least one year, because of that 2004 is chosen as the last year for migration to İstanbul.

There is no statistical data about the proportion of squatter settlements in sub-provinces of İstanbul. But it is known that Kağıthane, Ümraniye, Sultanbeyli, Bağcılar are some of sub-provinces that most of the houses are unlicensed (Sönmez, 1994, 1996, Işık and Pınarcıoğlu, 2001, Erder, 1996). Kağıthane is the sub-province which has the highest population growth between 1985 and 1990 due to in-migration. Therefore, Kağıthane was purposefully selected as a sub-province to represent the squatter settlement regions of İstanbul. The reasons for selecting just one sub-province are both financial constraints and the time limits. With the information collected from headmen in the Kağıthane's neighborhoods, settlements where residence were mostly migrants came to İstanbul after 1985, were identified. These settlements are mostly located in the downtown of Kağıthane, Nurtepe, Yahya Kemal

and Hamidiye neighborhoods. Headmen also pinpointed streets where residents were mostly migrants of 1985 and after, in these neighborhoods. In these streets, households were selected through systematic sampling. A household was chosen randomly as a starting point in each street, and then every second house was selected. In each of the selected households, for the eligibility of the non-participant, each headed household adult was asked whether s/he has ever participated in any adult education activity during their lifespan, if s/he migrated to the city between 1985 and 2004, if s/he accepted being interviewed, to be included within the sample group of the study. In every household, only one head of household was interviewed. If the person did not meet the criteria or did not except being interviewed for the research, s/he was not included in the sample and the next house was visited for the interview. In these four neighborhoods, 202 subjects (household) were interviewed.

3.2. Data Collection Instruments

The instrument of the study is the structured interview form which includes Reasons for Non-participation Scale (RENOPAS) developed by Cem Kirazoğlu in 1996 in Istanbul and questions related to the demographic characteristics of the subjects (Appendix A).

a) Reasons for Non-Participation Scale (RENOPAS)

The Reasons for Non-Participation Scale RENOPAS consists of 67 four points Likert type statement. RENOPAS was developed to assess the non-participation reasons' of adults in adult education activities. In the first three steps of the development of the RENOPAS, Kirazoğlu reviewed related literature; and interviewed 20 non-participant and 25 experts from the field of education. For the content validity of the instrument, 25 judges evaluated the form of RENOPAS in

terms of the defined factors such as situational, institutional, informational and psychosocial barriers defined by Darkenwald and Merriam (1982). For the reliability and construct validity, the instrument was administered to 325 non-participants. First form of RENOPAS consisted of 74, four points Likert type items indicating the reasons for non-participation. The instrument was found to be highly reliable (Cronbach alpha is .9323). Factor analysis and judges classification carried out for the construct validity of the instrument. After reliability and validity analysis items were deleted and the number of items decreased to 67 in the RENOPAS.

b) Demographic Information Form:

The questionnaire that includes RENOPAS has a section for the demographic characteristics of the people. While demographic information form of this study was being developed by the researcher, RENOPAS's demographic information form was utilized, and the researcher added some further demographic information questions. Demographic information part of the interview form includes the following questions: gender, age, place of birth/origin, marital status, educational level, number of children, educational status of the children, occupational status of the non-participant and his/her spouse, house ownership, ownership of another house, perceived family financial status, perceived SES, direction of migration, date of migration to Istanbul, reasons of preferring Istanbul and their non-formal and/or informal learning experience. Finally, a pilot study is conducted with ten migrant adults who never participated in any organized adult education activities from different educational levels to see the appropriateness of the demographic questions. According to these interviews, the demographic questions were reorganized in terms of their clarity.

3.3. Procedures

During data collection, every subjects in the sample is interviewed at their homes or coffee houses (kahvehane). 35 male subjects are interviewed in coffee houses to represent both genders equally because it is not possible to interview with them at their home.

The data is collected within two weeks of July, 2005 by the researcher herself and by trained interviewers. Trained interviewers who are the friends of the researcher were voluntary for the research and most of them were university graduates. They were trained by the researcher about the aim of the research and the application of the interview form. At the end of the data collection period, researcher was able to reach 106 females and 96 males (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1. *Distribution of the sample by neighborhood*

<i>District</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>
Kağıthane Central	27	21
Nurtepe	35	35
Yahya Kemal	24	23
Hamidiye	20	17
Total	106	96

3.4. Analysis of Data

The statistical software package for windows (SPSS 13.01) is used for statistical analysis. For demographic information, crosstabulation, frequency distribution and percentiles were carried out. A factor analysis was done to understand the major factors that effect migrant adults' non-participation in adult education activities. Factor analysis was used with rotation method and varimax with Kaiser Normalization to see combination of the items. The criterion for factor extraction is the eigenvalues 1 or higher.

Depending on the number of the categories of the independent variables t-test or one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) were carried out that to see the effect of independent variables on the factors of non-participation reasons. If there were statistically significant effects on independent variables on the factors at the end of a one-way ANOVA analyses, post hoc test, Scheffe multiple ranges procedure was implemented to see which group(s) make(s) the difference.

Some statistical symbols and letter used in the tables that show the results of data analysis are represented below.

n	Sample size in that category
f	Frequency
%	Percent
s	Standard deviation
\bar{x}	Mean
t_0	Observed t-test result
P	Significance level
SS	Sum of squares
df	Degree of freedom
MS	Mean square
F_0	Observed F-test value

4. FINDINGS

Data of this study was gathered from 202 subjects who were migrants and did not participate in any adult education activities provided by any public or private educational institution. Findings of the study are presented in this chapter, in three sections: demographic findings, findings of non-formal and/or informal learning, and the results of the implementation of RENOPAS.

4.1. Demographic Findings

In the interview form, there were questions about the following demographic characteristics of the subjects: gender, age, marital status, number of children, educational level, occupational status of the non-participant and his/her spouse, house ownership, perceived family financial status, and perceived SES, place of birth, reasons of migration to Istanbul, and migration time to Istanbul.

Age Level. Among the 106 female (52.5%) and 96 male (47.5%) interviewed, majority were 30 years old and older (Table 4.1). If subjects' age group were taken into consideration according to migration time, 63.7% of the age group who were less than 25 years old migrated to İstanbul after 1995, and 83.0% of the subjects in 40-49 age group migrated between 1985 and 1995 (Appendix B1).

Table 4.1. *The subjects' age groups by gender*

Age Group	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male		<i>f</i>	%
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%		
Less than 25	17	16.0	5	5.2	22	10.9
25-29	27	25.5	21	21.9	48	23.8
30-39	34	32.1	45	46.9	79	39.1
40-49	20	18.9	21	21.9	41	20.3
50-	8	7.5	4	4.2	12	5.9
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

Marital Status. Most of the subjects were married (84.2%). The percentage of married female subjects (90.6%) was greater than the proportion of the married males (77.1%) (Table.4.2).

Table 4.2. *The subjects' marital status by gender*

Marital Status	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male		<i>f</i>	%
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%		
Single	6	5.7	19	19.8	25	12.4
Married	96	90.6	74	77.1	170	84.2
Divorced	1	0.9	2	2.1	3	1.5
Widow	3	2.8	1	1.0	4	2.0
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

Number of Children. Out of 177 subjects (except single subjects), 165 of them had at least 1 child and at most 11 children. Total number of children in the sample was 445. Among 170 married subjects, 6.5% of them had no children. Mean score of children per household with children was 2.51. Married subjects with two children constituted 32.4 % (Table 4.3).

Table 4.3. *The subjects' number of children by marital status*

Number of Children	Marital Status								Total	
	Single		Married		Divorced		Widow			
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
No child	25	100	11	6.5	1	33.3	0	0	37	18.3
One	0	0	24	14.1	1	33.3	0	0	25	12.4
Two	0	0	55	32.4	1	33.3	1	25.0	57	28.2
Three	0	0	38	22.4	0	0	1	25.0	39	19.3
Four	0	0	25	14.7	0	0	0	0	25	12.4
Five and more	0	0	17	10.0	0	0	2	50.0	19	9.4
Total	25	100	170	100	3	100	4	100	202	100

Educational Level. Educational levels were taken into consideration according to graduation level, because there were only a few subjects in some categories (for detail information about educational level see Appendix B2). Most of the subjects were primary school graduates (56.4%) and those who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school dropouts (22.3%). High school and higher education graduates were equal (7.9%). Among the female subjects 35.8% did not attend any formal schooling and they were primary school dropouts while males in this category are only 7.3%. Percentages of male subjects (30.2%) who attended formal schools six or more years was two times higher from the percentages of their females counterparts who received six or more years of schooling (13.2%) (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4. *The subjects' educational level by gender*

Educational Level	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male			
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Not attended and primary school dropout	38	35.8	7	7.3	45	22.3
Primary school graduate	54	50.9	60	62.5	114	56.4
Junior high sc. graduate	3	2.8	8	8.3	11	5.4
High sc. graduate	4	3.8	12	12.5	16	7.9
Higher Ed. graduate	7	6.6	9	9.4	16	7.9
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

125 of children of migrants were between 0 and 7 years old who were not attending school yet. Most of migrants' children were attending compulsory education (34.4%), it is followed with the graduated from primary school (19.4%). About 10% of female did not attend any formal schooling or dropped primary school (Appendix B3).

Occupational Status. Most of the males were either blue collar workers (59.4%) or white collar workers (11.5%), and entrepreneur (11.5 %) as see in Table 4.5. Most of the females were housewives (66.0%), blue collar worker (13.2%) and housewives but doing something at home to earn money to support their family financially (12.3%). Among eight un-employed males, only two of them were single, and six of them were married.

Table 4.5. *The subjects' occupational status by gender*

Occupational Status	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
Blue collar worker	14	13.2	57	59.4	71	35.1
White collar worker	6	5.7	11	11.5	17	8.4
Entrepreneur	1	0.9	11	11.5	12	5.9
Housewife (doing thing at home)	13	12.3	0	0	13	6.4
Housewife	70	66.0	0	0	70	34.7
Retired	2	1.9	9	9.4	11	5.4
Un-employed	0	0	8	8.3	8	4.0
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

Most of the male subjects' spouses were also housewives (87.1%) and most of the female subjects' spouses are blue collar workers (72.6%) (Table 4.6). Only 2.2% of male mentioned that their wife was working at home to support their families' financial position.

Table 4.6. *The subjects' spouses' occupational status by gender*

Occupational Status	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
Blue collar worker	69	71.9	7	9.5	76	44.7
White collar worker	6	6.3	2	2.7	8	4.7
Entrepreneur	5	5.2	0	0	5	2.9
Housewife (doing thing at home)	0	0	1	1.4	1	0.6
Housewife	0	0	63	85.1	63	37.1
Un-employed	14	14.6	0	0	14	8.2
Retired	2	2.1	1	1.4	3	1.8
Total	96	100	74	100	170	100

House Ownership. Most of the subjects were living in rental houses (63.67%) as seen in Table 4.7. Nearly half of the house owners were early migrants between 1985 and 1989 (45.9%) (Appendix B4). Among house owners only 12 of them has another house (16.22%).

Table 4.7. *The house ownership*

House Ownership	f	%
Own house	74	36.33
Rental	128	63.67
Total	202	100

Perceived Family Financial Status. About 40% of the sample perceived their family financial status as middle level, the next largest group perceived below middle level (33.2%). Female subject perceived their family financial status worse than males (Table 4.8).

Table 4.8. *The subjects' perceived family financial status by gender*

Perceived Financial Status	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male			
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Low level	28	26.4	21	21.9	49	24.3
Below middle level	39	36.8	28	29.2	67	33.2
Middle level	37	34.9	43	44.8	80	39.6
Above middle level	2	1.9	4	4.2	6	3.0
High level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

Perceived SES. One question of the study was related to how the non-participant migrants perceive their status (place) in the society considering their jobs, educational level, the sub-province that they live in, and income level. According to findings, most of the subject perceived their places in the society at the middle level (40.1%); then come the ones who perceived their place in the society below the middle level (31.7%). None of the subject perceived their SES at high level (Table 4.9).

Table 4.9. *The subjects' perceived SES by gender*

Perceived SES	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male			
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Low	24	22.6	16	16.7	40	19.8
Below middle	36	34.0	28	29.2	64	31.7
Middle	40	37.7	41	42.7	81	40.1
Above middle	6	5.7	11	11.5	17	8.4
High level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

Place of Birth. About 33 percent of the sample was from Black Sea region and it's followed by the migrants from Eastern Anatolia (27.2%) and South Eastern Anatolia (20.8%) regions (Table 4.10).

Table 4.10. *The subjects' place of birth by gender*

The Region	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
Black Sea Region	42	39.6	25	26.0	67	33.2
Eastern Anatolia Region	20	18.9	35	36.5	55	27.2
South Eastern Anatolia	17	16.0	25	26.0	42	20.8
Central Anatolia Region	14	13.2	8	8.3	22	10.9
Aegean Region	7	6.6	0	0	7	3.5
Marmara Region	4	3.8	2	2.1	6	3.0
Mediterranean Region	2	1.9	1	0.5	3	1.5
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

Reasons of Migration. Forty eight subjects (23.8%) migrated to İstanbul after they had migrated some place else before. Main reasons of migration from their land were economic reasons (39.6%), marriage (10.4%) and job of spouses (12.5%). Interestingly, forced migration (10.4%) and lack of security (6.3%) was mentioned by eight people.

Reasons of migration to İstanbul, 202 subjects indicated mostly in a parallel way with indicated by above mentioned 48 subjects: economical reasons (60.9%), marriage (11.4%), and spouses' job (6.4%). Forced migration and lack of security was mentioned 8.4% of the sample for the reasons of migration to İstanbul (Table 4.11).

Table 4.11. *The subjects' reasons for migration*

Reasons for Migration	Migrant to İstanbul		First migration	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Economical reasons	123	60.9	19	39.6
Marriage	23	11.4	5	10.4
Spouse's job	13	6.4	0	12.5
Forced migration	13	6.4	5	10.4
Security	4	2.0	3	6.3
Education	13	6.4	4	8.3
Health	4	2.0	1	2.1
Appointment	7	3.5	4	8.3
Relatives	2	1.0	1	2.1
Total	202	100	48	100

Migration Time. Among the sample, 32.2 % came to İstanbul between 1985 and 1989. Most of the females migrated to İstanbul between 1990 and 1994 (32.1%) and most of the males came between 1985 and 1989 (42.7%) (Table 4.12).

According to crosstabulation of migration time and the region that they were born in, most of the migrants from Black Sea (65.7%), Eastern Anatolia (65.46%), and Southeastern Anatolia (54.8%) migrated to İstanbul between 1985 and 1995 (Appendix B5).

Table 4.12. *Migration time of the subjects by gender*

Migration Time	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male			
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
1985-1989	26	24.5	41	42.7	67	33.2
1990-1994	34	32.1	21	21.9	55	27.2
1995-1999	26	24.5	22	22.9	48	23.8
2000-2004	20	18.9	12	12.5	32	15.8
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

4.2. Learning Experiences

In terms of the types of non-formal and/or informal learning experiences of migrant adults, 61.4 percent of subjects identified at least one non-formal and/or informal learning experience in İstanbul (see Table 4.13). Most of the learners were

female (60.5%). According to educational level, most of the learners were primary school graduates (53.2%), and subjects who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school dropouts (21%), and less than 39 years old (79.8%) (Table 4.13). For additional information about non-formal/informal learners see Appendix B6.

Table 4.13. *Demographic characteristics of respondents of non-formal and/or informal learning*

Demographic Characteristics		Learning experience		
		<i>Total</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
Gender	Female	106	75	70.8
	Male	96	49	51.0
Age groups	Less than 25	22	17	77.3
	25-29	48	35	72.9
	30-39	79	47	59.5
	40-49	41	20	48.8
	50+	12	5	41.7
Educational level	Not attended	45	26	57.8
	Primary school graduate	114	66	57.9
	Junior high sc. graduate	11	8	72.7
	High sc. graduate	16	10	62.5
	Higher Ed. graduate	18	14	77.8

Answers about non-formal and/or informal learning experiences of migrant adults were classified into nine different learning areas (see Table 4.14) by the researcher. There are skills related with women, job related learning, religious belief, socialization, city life, political awareness, Turkish language, learning on their own, and others.

Job Related. Some subjects who defined learning experiences related with a job that they learned this job in the work place with the assistance of experienced workers, or by practicing it. Painting, apprenticeship, car repairing, manufacturing cloths, textile, and shoe shining are some types of on the job learning. That is generally a kind of informal learning because people are learning their jobs from experienced workers or learning by doing in practice.

Religious Belief. Some “Sunni” subjects (n=31) mentioned religious learning in their close environment with hodja at community meetings. Learning how to read Koran, information about religious rituals were some types of religious learning occurred in these community meetings. That is generally a kind of informal learning because people are transmitting the religious knowledge by practicing; however it is also a kind of non-formal learning because of its organized characteristics (somebody purposefully organize them). It is known that Alevi have different place to pray and different praying rituals. Some of the Alevi subjects (n=6) mentioned that they learned and practiced their religious identity in these places and there were some meetings about social issues as well. That is a kind of non-formal learning which is organized in a setting purposefully.

Gendered Skills Related with Women. Some female subjects mentioned that they learned to produce handicrafts either to save money or to support home economics from their close environment. Lacework, embroidery, sewing, clothing, and macramé were some types of craft that was mentioned by mostly female respondents. That is a kind of informal learning because females are transmitting the methods of producing that kind of things as well as transmitting the knowledge of “being a good woman”.

Socialization. Most common type of socialization was in associations related to solidarity with village or town of origin. In these associations, different kinds of activities were carried. Meetings about the problems of the sub-province that they were living in or origin, cultural activities (such as playing folk instrument and folk dances, theatre), and seminars (such as child rearing, women health) were frequently mentioned activities in these associations. It is a kind of non-formal learning because these activities are organized by associations for educational purposes.

City Life. Some subjects mentioned that there are important differences in human relations, daily life, and the way of coping with the problems in their origin and in İstanbul; and they defined that they learned how to behave, communicate with others and cope with economical problems as of their life in İstanbul. That is a kind of informal learning because people observe the new environment and behave according to the circumstances by self-socialization in a new environment.

Learning on their own. Some of the subjects mentioned that (n=5) they read books to learn new things or for enjoyment. Five male subjects mentioned that they learned how to use computer and they use internet as a source of information.

Turkish Language. Some of the subjects mentioned their native language was not Turkish and they learned Turkish in İstanbul by communicating with Turkish speakers more frequently. One of the subject mentioned that she spoke a dialect of Turkish and after migrating to İstanbul, she realized that people could not understand her and she tried to change her dialect to communicate people effectively.

Political Awareness. Some subjects mentioned that they involved in a political grouping either in a political party or politically oriented NGOs (Non-governmental organizations). Defined learning experiences in a political awareness include ethnic identity, religious identity, and dynamics of social and political developments in the Turkey as well as in abroad, and finding a way to help poor and undereducated neighbors. That is a kind of informal learning, because participation in these kinds of grouping was not aimed to educational purposes by the subjects as well as the group itself.

Others. In this category, most mentioned type of learning was about child rearing from doctors and local clinics (n=4), and driving license courses; then some

sports activities in local sport centers. Two female subjects mentioned that they learned reading and writing in associations of their village.

Among the respondents, 55 of them defined more than one type of non-formal and/or informal learning experiences. As many people mentioned a number of categories stated at the same time, total number of categories was not equal to number of people responded as seen in Table 4.14-16. Most of the female respondents had a learning experience related with women (27.1%), and religious belief (21.7%). However, most of the respondents of male subjects had a learning experiences related with job (33.3%) and socialization in associations (25.0%) as seen in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14. *Responses to learning experiences by gender*

Learning Areas	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
Job related	16	12.4	24	33.3	40	19.9
Religious beliefs	28	21.7	10	13.9	38	18.9
Skills related with women	35	27.1	0	0	35	17.4
Socialization	11	8.5	18	25.0	29	14.4
City life	11	8.5	6	8.3	17	8.5
Learning on their own	4	3.1	6	8.3	10	5.0
Turkish language	8	6.2	1	1.4	9	4.5
Political awareness	4	3.1	3	4.2	7	3.5
Others	12	9.3	4	5.6	16	8.0
Total	129	100	72	100	201	100

According to age groups, most of the subjects who were less than 25 years old, had learning experiences on “skills related with women” (27.6%), “job related learning”, and learning about “religious beliefs” (24.1%). Subjects who were within the range of 25-29 years old, most frequently stated “job related learning” and “skills related with women” equally (19.0%), followed by learning about “religious beliefs” (15.5%), and “socialization” in associations (13.8%). Subjects between the age of 30

and 39, mentioned most frequently “job related learning” (22.1%), “socialization” in associations (19.5%), and followed by learning about “religious beliefs” (15.6%).

Subjects who were within the range of 40-49 years old, most frequently stated learning about “religious beliefs” (21.4%), “skills related with women” (17.9%).

Nearly half of the subjects, who were older than 49 years old, had learning experiences on “religious beliefs” (44.4%) (Table 4.15).

Table 4.15. *Responses to learning experiences by age group*

Learning Areas	Age Groups									
	-25		25-29		30-39		40-49		50-	
	F	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Job related	7	24.1	11	19.0	17	22.1	3	10.7	2	22.2
Religious beliefs	7	24.1	9	15.5	12	15.6	6	21.4	4	44.4
Skills related with women	8	27.6	11	19.0	10	13.0	5	17.9	1	11.1
Socialization	2	6.9	8	13.8	15	19.5	4	14.3	0	0
City life	1	3.4	5	8.6	8	10.4	2	7.1	1	11.1
Learning on their own	2	6.9	3	5.2	5	6.5	0	0	0	0
Turkish language	0	0	4	6.9	3	3.9	1	3.6	1	11.1
Political awareness	1	3.4	2	3.4	2	2.6	2	7.1	0	0
Others	1	3.4	5	8.6	5	6.5	5	17.9	0	0
Total	29	100	58	100	77	100	28	100	9	100

According to educational level of non-formal/informal learning areas, subjects who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school dropouts, most frequently stated “skills related with women” (28.9%), followed by learning about “religious beliefs” (15.5%). Subjects who were primary school graduates, most frequently stated “job related learning” (27.5%), followed by learning about “religious beliefs” (19.6%). Subjects who were junior high schools graduates, most frequently mentioned “job related learning” and learning about “religious beliefs”, and “socialization” in associations equally (23.1%). High school graduates mentioned learning about “religious beliefs”, and “socialization” in associations equally (21.4%). Nearly half of the subjects who were higher education institution graduates, stated “socialization” in associations (44.4%) (Table 4.16).

Table 4.16. *Educational level and learning*

Learning Areas	Educational Level									
	Not attend/ Pr. dropout		Primary sc. graduate		Junior High sc. grad.		High sc. graduate		Higher inst. grad.	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Job related	5	11.1	28	27.5	3	23.1	2	14.3	0	0
Religious beliefs	11	24.4	20	19.6	3	23.1	3	21.4	1	3.7
Skills related with women	13	28.9	19	18.6	2	15.4	1	7.1	2	7.4
Socialization	2	4.4	9	8.8	3	23.1	3	21.4	12	44.4
City life	3	6.7	11	10.8	1	7.7	2	14.3	0	0
Learning on their own	1	2.2	6	5.9	0	0	1	7.1	2	7.4
Turkish language	8	17.8	1	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Political awareness	0	0	3	2.9	0	0	0	0	4	14.8
Others	2	4.4	5	4.9	1	7.7	2	14.3	6	22.2
Total	45	100	102	100	13	100	14	100	27	100

4.3. Results of the Implementation of RENOPAS

RENOPAS is the instrument for assessing the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities was implemented to gather answer for the question of “what are the major factors that effect their non-participation”.

When factor analysis was carried, principal components extracted 16 factors that met the criterion for retention, accounting for 70.6 percent of the scale variance (factor loadings are given Appendix C) by using rotation method and varimax with Kaiser Normalization. In Kirazoğlu’ s study (1996), the implementation of RENOPAS indicated eight main factors that explain the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities, namely financial constrains, negative attitudes toward education, time constrains, fear and hesitation regarding the environment, low self-confidence, communicational barriers, family responsibility, and institutional barriers.

In this research, to compare with Kirazoğlu’s eight factors and to make meaningful analysis, number of factors extracted to eight factors. When factors extracted to eight factors in this research, it explains 55.1 percent of the scale

variance and all factors had more than two items according to highest factor loadings (for factor loadings see Appendix D and Table 4.17-4.24). The factors of this research renamed when it was necessary by comparing the items in the factor with Kirazoğlu's factors name and the contents of the factors as F1- low self-confidence, F2- negative attitudes toward education, F3- financial and communicational barriers, F4-time constraints, F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses, F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment, F7- dissatisfaction from education, F8-unwillingness to participate.

4.3.1. Factor Contents

For each of eight factors and the items which were included in each factor with the item numbers, factor loadings and factor descriptions are presented below.

F1- Low Self Confidence. This factor contained 15 items (Table 4.17) with the mean score of 1.5. The items indicated the low self-esteem with the dimensions of being a part of new/strange environment, shyness, age related negative perceptions, fear from new environment and experiences, feeling of low personal competency because of low level of education. This factor accounted alone for 11.4 percent of the scale variance which was the highest in the factor analysis. This factor and items were similar with the RENOPAS' factor named as "low self confidence" in the Kirazoğlu's study (for comparing see Appendix E).

Table 4.17. *The items in the factor of low self-confidence*

<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Loading</i>
8. Because I think I won't understand the lectures given	.818
7. Because I don't have confidence in my learning abilities	.743
57. Because I forget what I have learned very easily	.710
20. Because I am old	.687
41. Because people who are as old as me do not usually attend courses	.667
15. Because I can't compete with younger students	.632
36. Because I am afraid of being unsuccessful in the courses	.616
58. Because my reading and writing skills are not adequate	.593
26. Because my education is very poor	.582
61. Because learning new things is difficult	.576
35. I wouldn't like to answer questions in front of everybody in class	.553
62. Because I feel shy in an unfamiliar environment	.551
43. Because I think people around me would laugh at me if I participated in courses	.551
56. Because I am not healthy	.409
44. Because I think I am lazy	.231

F2- Negative Attitudes toward Education. This factor included 11 items (Table 4.18) with the mean score of 1.6. They indicated negative beliefs and thoughts about usefulness, necessity of education, low level of benefits of education, difficulty of courses, interest to participate are the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities. Item 6, "I have heard that the course instructors do not treat the course participants well" had the lowest factor loading with the second lowest mean (1.14) among 67 items (see Appendix F for descriptive statistics of the items). This factor and items were similar with the RENOPAS' factor named as "negative attitudes toward education" in Kirazoğlu's research.

Table 4.18. *The items in the factor of negative attitudes toward education*

<i>Factor 2</i>	<i>Loading</i>
17. Because I don't believe the courses would provide me with opportunities	.739
48. Because I don't believe participating in courses would help increase my income	.738
12. Because I don't believe training would help me in my job/profession	.734
64. Such things do not cause earn money	.684
21. Because I don't believe completing a course would help me in finding a job	.680
10. Because I find it unnecessary to participate in courses	.650
9. Because I am not interested in taking courses	.564
11. Because I don't believe the institutions organizing available courses are qualified	.562
60. Because I see no necessity for participating in a learning activity	.560
42. Because I think the courses are difficult	.527
6. I have heard that the course instructors do not treat the course participants well	.301

F3- Financial and Communicational Barriers. This factor contained 12 items (Table 4.19) with the mean score of 2.5. These items indicated the financial constraints, lack of financial support and expenses of these educational activities and communicational barriers that mean lack of information about the available courses. In Kirazoğlu's research, same items were in to two separate factors, namely "financial constraints" and "communicational barriers" except the Item 18. "because the courses are at inconvenient locations".

Table 4.19. *The items in the factor of financial and communicational barriers*

<i>Factor 3</i>	<i>Loading</i>
54. Because I am not financially sufficient	.714
47. Because the transportation expenses are very high	.703
22. Because I have never seen any advertisement about the courses opened in my environment	.659
59. Because I haven't heard about the courses offered	.650
34. Because courses are very expensive	.635
33. Because earning a living is greater trouble	.613
14. Because I don't have information about the available adult education courses	.562
2. Because I think I can't afford the expenses necessary for the courses	.541
45. Because I don't have information about the institutions organizing the courses	.534
67. Because transportation is very difficult	.528
18. Because the courses are at inconvenient locations	.480
32. Because my family did not support me financially	.411

F4- Time constraints. That factor contained nine items which is related with time limitation and not having enough time to participate courses because of occupation (Table 4.20) with the mean score of 2.2. The name of the factor and its items fit with Kirazoğlu's implementation of RENOPAS.

Table 4.20. *The items in the factor of time constraints*

<i>Factor 4</i>	<i>Loading</i>
24. Because I get tired at work	.816
55. Because where I work it is very busy	.790
53. Because I can't get permission from the work place	.775
25. Because I don't want to waste my time that is already very limited	.749
39. Because there is nobody to take care my job at work	.747
27. Because I don't have enough time for participating in courses regularly	.534
1. Because I don't have the time for participation	.482
31. I have no time because I have another job	.429
63. Because I have no extra time for such things	.418

F5- Family responsibility and familiarity with the courses. This factor consisted of seven items which explained low personal priority, versus high family priority and being unfamiliar with the content and participants of the courses (Table

4.21) with the mean score of 1.9. Item 29, “because I can’t find anybody to attend courses together with me” was perceived as a need of familiarity of the participant of the courses by the researcher. When this factor was compared with previous study, Items 50, 40, 4, and 13 are on the factor of “family responsibility” in Kirazoğlu’s research. Considering the additional items 30, 29, and 19 with the other items, this factor was named as “family responsibility and familiarity with the courses” in this research.

Table 4.21. *The items in the factor of family responsibility and familiarity with the courses*

<i>Factor 5</i>	<i>Loading</i>
50. Because I can’t find time because of housework	.784
40. Because I have to take care of my family	.692
4. Because it is difficult for me to find any place to leave my children to be taken care of	.665
13. Because I want to spend most of my time with my family	.623
30. Because I don’t know what is going on in these courses	.487
29. Because I can’t find anybody to attend courses together with me	.404
19. Because I don’t know what kind of people attend such courses	.451

F6- Fear and hesitation regarding the environment. That factor had seven items which were related family permission, course instructors and the duration of the courses (Table 4.22) with the mean score of 1.7. Items 3, 49 and 66 were in the factor of institutional barriers in Kirazoğlu’s research, in spite of that this factor had same name with previous implementation of RENOPAS.

Table 4.22. *The items in the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment*

<i>Factor 6</i>	<i>Loading</i>
52. Because my mother-in law- don't allow me to participate	.592
23. Because my family did not allow me	.489
65. Because the course instructor would be of the other sex	.444
3. Because I don't know the instructors in those courses well enough	.483
5. Because my spouse don't allow me to participate	.433
49. Because it takes too long to finish the courses	.461
66. Because course hours last too long	.419

F7- Dissatisfaction from educational activities. That factor had three items which were related with dissatisfaction because of the content of the courses, and lack of desire and satisfaction from courses (Table 4.23) with the mean score of 1.6. These three items were in the factor of negative attitudes toward education in previous research; however, the content of the factor related with dissatisfaction from courses, because of that, this factor was named as dissatisfaction from educational activities by the researcher.

Table 4.23. *The items in the factor of dissatisfaction from educational activities*

<i>Factor 7</i>	<i>Loading</i>
51. Because no courses are offered I have desired	.699
16. Because I can't find any courses on subjects that I am interested in	.677
28. Because the courses are not sufficient for satisfying our needs	.516

F8-Unwillingness to participate. That factor consisted of three items with the mean score of 1.3. These items are not interrelated and had one of the lowest mean scores (1.11; 1.45; and 1.26) (Table 4.24).

Table 4.24. *The items in the factor of unwillingness to participate*

<i>Factor 8</i>	<i>Loading</i>
38. Because I can't usually find place in the courses	.635
46. If I take a course people would think that I am ignorant	.471
37. Because I think I would be bored	.446

4.3.2. The Effect of Demographic Characteristics on the Factors

In order to see whether there was an effect of the demographic characteristics of the sample on the reasons of non-participation in organized adult education activities, t-test or one-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) was carried out.

The Effect of Gender. T-test analysis was carried out in order to see whether the gender makes difference on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (at .000 alpha levels) were found on the following factors: “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, “F4- time constraints”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, and “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”. Females’ scores were significantly higher than of the males on the factors of “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, and “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”. Males’ scores were significantly higher than of females on the factor of “F4- time constraints”. There were no significant differences between genders on the factors of “F2- negative attitudes toward education”, “F7- dissatisfaction from education”, and “F8- unwillingness to participate” (Table 4.25).

Table 4.25. *t-test results for the factors by gender*

Factors	Female			Male			t_o	p
	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s		
F1	106	1.71	.709	96	1.31	.446	23.060	.000
F2	106	1.59	.572	96	1.68	.769	-.845	NS
F3	106	2.73	.862	96	2.32	.745	12.585	.000
F4	106	1.86	.593	96	2.63	.859	-54.728	.000
F5	106	2.41	.783	96	1.35	.395	142.003	.000
F6	106	1.81	.673	96	1.51	.425	13.951	.000
F7	106	1.58	.850	96	1.57	.797	.006	NS
F8	106	1.28	.460	96	1.26	.440	.063	NS

The Effect of Age. One-way analysis of variances (ANOVA) showed that whether age groups' score different on the each factor. Age groups used in this study were less than 25, 25-29, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 and above. Significant differences (at .002 to .024) were found on the factors "F1- low self confidence", "F3- financial and communicational barriers", and "F4- time constraints". There were no significant difference between age groups on the factors of "F2- negative attitudes toward education", "F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses", "F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment", "F7- dissatisfaction from education", and "F8-unwillingness to participate" (Table 4.26).

Older than 49 years old subjects with mean 2.27 had significantly higher scores than other younger age groups (the highest \bar{x} =1.53 for other the age groups) on the factor of "F1- low self confidence" according to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure. Factor of "F3- financial and communicational barriers", there could not differentiated at alpha 0.05 level but, older than 49 years group (\bar{x} =3.06) had significantly higher scores than less than 25 years old age group (\bar{x} =2.11) at alpha 0.1 level. Factor of "F4- time constraints", cannot be pinpointed at alpha .05 level, but, 30-39 age group (\bar{x} =2.47) had significantly higher scores than less than 25 years old (\bar{x} =1.74) and older than 49 years age groups (\bar{x} =1.75) at alpha .1 level.

Table 4.26. *One-way ANOVA results for on the factors by the age groups*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	P
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	7.825	4	1.956	72.148	197	.366	5.341	.000
F2	1.915	4	.479	88.950	197	.452	1.060	NS
F3	7.642	4	1.910	131.329	197	.667	2.866	.024
F4	12.683	4	3.171	123.574	197	.627	5.055	.001
F5	1.816	4	.454	133.707	197	.679	.669	NS
F6	1.029	4	.257	68.230	197	.346	.743	NS
F7	3.817	4	.954	132.357	197	.672	1.420	NS
F8	.404	4	.101	40.287	197	.205	.494	NS

Marital Status. T-test was carried out to see whether marital status makes difference on the scores of each factor. Divorced and widowed subjects were not taken into consideration because there were only a few subjects in these categories. Significant differences (at .000 to .026) were found on the factors “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, “F4- time constraints”, and “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”. There were no significant differences between adults with different marital status on the scores of factors “F2- negative attitudes toward education”, “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”, “F7- dissatisfaction from education”, and “F8-unwillingness to participate” (Table 4.27).

Married sample scores were higher than of singles on the factors of “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, and “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”. It should be mentioned that most of the single subjects were male (76%). Single subjects’ scores were higher than of married subjects on the factors of “F4- time constraints” (Table 4.27).

Table 4.27. *t*-test results for the factors by marital status

Factors	Married			Single			t_o	p
	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s		
F1	170	1.55	.628	25	1.19	.343	7.877	.006
F2	170	1.65	.686	25	1.49	.592	1.255	NS
F3	170	2.61	.817	25	2.11	.725	8.248	.005
F4	170	2.19	.810	25	2.58	.770	-5.037	.026
F5	170	1.99	.830	25	1.32	.381	15.968	.000
F6	170	1.68	.611	25	1.53	.346	1.484	NS
F7	170	1.53	.780	25	1.72	.832	-1.306	NS
F8	170	1.27	.461	25	1.29	.412	-0.075	NS

Number of Children. One-way ANOVA was carried out from (excluding singles) subjects in order to test for the difference between the groups with different number of children (no child, one, two, three, four, and five and more) on the scores

of each factor. Significant differences (at .001 and .08 level) were found on the factors of “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, and “F7- dissatisfaction from educational activities”. There were no significant differences between adults with different number of children on the scores of factors “F2- negative attitudes toward education”, “F4- time constraints”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”, and “F8-unwillingness to participate” (Table 4.28).

To see why the significant difference occur Scheffe multiple range procedure was carried. In terms of the first factor-F1, there were significant differences between subjects with five or more children ($\bar{x}=2.12$) and other groups (no child $\bar{x}=1.23$; one child $\bar{x}=1.35$; two $\bar{x}=1.49$; three children $\bar{x}=1.53$) except the subjects with four children. For the factor of “F3- financial and communicational barriers” subjects with five or more children ($\bar{x}=3.06$) scored significantly higher than ones with no child ($\bar{x}=2.06$). For the factor of “F7- dissatisfaction from educational activities”, subjects with no child ($\bar{x}=2.47$) had significantly higher scores than other groups (one child $\bar{x}=1.51$; two $\bar{x}=1.50$; three $\bar{x}=1.47$; four children $\bar{x}=1.43$) except subjects with five or more children.

Table 4.28. *One-way ANOVA test for the factors by the number of children*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	9.661	5	1.932	64.338	171	.376	5.135	.000
F2	2.669	5	.534	79.212	171	.463	1.152	NS
F3	10.547	5	2.109	110.687	171	.647	3.259	.008
F4	6.671	5	1.334	111.813	171	.654	2.040	NS
F5	6.752	5	1.350	115.400	171	.675	2.001	NS
F6	1.438	5	.288	64.403	171	.377	.764	NS
F7	11.048	5	2.210	107.951	171	.631	3.500	.005
F8	1.186	5	.237	35.422	171	.207	1.145	NS

Education Level. One-way ANOVA was carried out to test for the difference between educational levels (not attended any formal schooling and primary school dropouts; primary school graduates; junior high school graduates; high school graduates; and higher educational institution graduates) of the subjects on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (at .000 and .002) were found on the factors “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, “F4- time constraints”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”, and “F7- high expectation from education”. There were no significant differences between adults’ educational level on the scores of factors “F2- negative attitudes toward education”, and “F8- unwillingness to participate” (Table 4.29).

According to Scheffe multiple range procedure, subjects who did not attend any formal schooling and subjects who were primary school dropouts ($\bar{x}=2.10$) had higher scores than all other groups (primary school $\bar{x}=1.43$; junior high school $\bar{x}=1.26$; high school $\bar{x}=1.13$; and higher educational institution graduates $\bar{x}=1.06$) on the factor of “F1- low self confidence”. Subjects who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school dropouts ($\bar{x}=3.08$) had higher scores than primary school ($\bar{x}=2.59$), junior high school ($\bar{x}=2.21$), high school ($\bar{x}=1.75$) and higher educational institution graduates ($\bar{x}=1.65$) and subjects who were primary school graduates had higher scores than high school and higher educational institution graduates on the factor of “F3- financial and communicational barriers”. According to post hoc analysis results, significant differences could not be pinpointed on the factor of “F4- time constraints”. However, primary school graduates had the highest mean score ($\bar{x}=3.35$), and higher educational institution graduates has the lowest one ($\bar{x}=1.74$). Subjects who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school

dropouts ($\bar{x}=2.52$) had higher scores than all other groups (primary school $\bar{x}=1.78$, junior high $\bar{x}=1.64$, high school $\bar{x}=1.54$ and higher educational institution graduates $\bar{x}=1.39$) on the factor of “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”. Subjects who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school dropouts ($\bar{x}=1.95$) had higher scores than all other groups (junior high school $\bar{x}=1.31$; high school $\bar{x}=1.38$; and higher educational institution graduates $\bar{x}=1.27$) except primary school graduates ($\bar{x}=1.69$) on the factor of “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”. Subjects who were higher educational institution graduates ($\bar{x}=2.58$) had higher scores than all other groups (who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school dropouts $\bar{x}=1.49$; primary school $\bar{x}=1.42$; junior high school $\bar{x}=1.61$) except high school graduates ($\bar{x}=1.90$) on the factor of “F7- dissatisfaction from educational activities”.

Table 4.29. *One- way ANOVA results for the factors by the educational level*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	22.654	4	5.663	57.319	197	.291	19.465	.000
F2	1.034	4	.259	89.830	197	.456	.567	NS
F3	37.182	4	9.295	101.789	197	.517	17.990	.000
F4	11.187	4	2.797	125.071	197	.635	4.405	.002
F5	25.082	4	6.270	110.441	197	.561	11.185	.000
F6	8.785	4	2.196	60.474	197	.307	7.155	.000
F7	20.858	4	5.214	115.316	197	.585	8.908	.000
F8	.325	4	.081	40.367	197	.205	.396	NS

Occupational Status. In terms of occupational statuses (blue collar, white collar worker, entrepreneur, housewife working at home, housewife, retired, unemployed), one-way ANOVA analysis indicated that there were significant differences (at .000) on the factors “F1- low self confidence”, “F2- negative attitudes toward education”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, “F4- time constraints”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, “F6- fear

and hesitation regarding the environment”, and “F7- dissatisfaction from educational activities” (Table 4.30).

On the other hand, Scheffe multiple range procedure indicated that housewives scored ($\bar{x}=1.86$) on “F1- low self confidence” significantly higher than blue ($\bar{x}=1.26$) and white collar ($\bar{x}=1.21$) workers; un-employed subjects ($\bar{x}=2.82$) scored on “F2- negative attitudes toward education” significantly higher than all other groups (blue collar worker $\bar{x}=1.49$; white collar worker $\bar{x}=1.65$; entrepreneur $\bar{x}=1.76$; housewife working at home $\bar{x}=1.84$; housewife $\bar{x}=1.59$; retired $\bar{x}=1.53$); housewives working at home ($\bar{x}=2.90$) scored on “F3-financial constraints and communicational barriers” significantly higher than white collar workers ($\bar{x}=1.86$); blue collar workers ($\bar{x}=2.76$) scored on “F4- time constraints” significantly higher than retired ($\bar{x}=1.85$), un-employed ($\bar{x}=1.82$), housewives working at home ($\bar{x}=1.75$), and housewives ($\bar{x}=1.75$), and entrepreneur ($\bar{x}=2.82$); housewives ($\bar{x}=2.60$) and housewives working at home ($\bar{x}=2.34$) scored on “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses” significantly higher than all other occupational status (blue collar worker $\bar{x}=1.48$; white collar worker $\bar{x}=1.45$; entrepreneur $\bar{x}=1.27$; retired $\bar{x}=1.61$; and un-employed $\bar{x}=1.25$); housewives ($\bar{x}=1.92$) scored on “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment” significantly higher than entrepreneurs ($\bar{x}=1.25$); white collar workers ($\bar{x}=2.33$) scored on “F7- dissatisfaction from education” significantly higher than blue collar workers ($\bar{x}=1.47$), housewives ($\bar{x}=1.45$), and entrepreneurs ($\bar{x}=1.19$).

Table 4.30. *One-way ANOVA results for the factors by occupational status*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	15.889	6	2.648	64.084	195	.329	8.058	.000
F2	13.651	6	2.275	77.213	195	.396	5.746	.000
F3	26.378	6	4.396	112.593	195	.577	7.614	.000
F4	46.654	6	7.776	89.604	195	.460	16.922	.000
F5	61.435	6	10.239	74.088	195	.380	26.950	.000
F6	9.640	6	1.607	59.620	195	.306	5.255	.000
F7	17.783	6	2.964	118.391	195	.607	4.882	.000
F8	.969	6	.161	39.723	195	.204	.793	NS

House Ownership. T-test was carried out to test for the difference between the house owners and the others on the scores of each factor. Significant difference (at .008) was found on the factor of “F4- time constraints”. There were no significant differences between house owners and the others on the scores of factors F1, F2, F3, F5, F6, F7, and F8 (Table 4.31). Subjects who were living in rental houses, scored significantly higher than house owners on the factor of “F4- time constraints”.

Table 4.31. *t-test results for the factors by house ownership*

Factors	House owner			Rental			t_o	p
	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s		
F1	74	1.56	.744	128	1.49	.557	.527	NS
F2	74	1.74	.759	128	1.57	.611	3.001	NS
F3	74	2.55	.957	128	2.53	.753	.051	NS
F4	74	2.02	.829	128	2.34	.800	-7.170	.008
F5	74	1.91	.858	128	1.91	.803	.002	NS
F6	74	1.58	.604	128	1.72	.573	-2.883	NS
F7	74	1.56	.883	128	1.59	.790	-.062	NS
F8	74	1.21	.347	128	1.31	.498	-2.128	NS

Perceived Family Financial Status. One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to see the difference between the groups with different perceived financial status (low, below middle, middle, above middle, and high level) on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (at .000 to .051) were found on the factor of “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, and “F6- fear

and hesitation regarding the environment”. There were no significant differences between different perceived financial statuses on the scores of factors “F2- negative attitudes toward education”, “F4- time constraints”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, “F7- dissatisfaction from education”, and “F8- unwillingness to participate” (Table 4.32).

According to Scheffe multiple range procedure, the subjects with below middle perceived financial status ($\bar{x}=1.67$) had higher scores than the ones with middle perceived financial status ($\bar{x}=1.39$) on the factor of “F1- low self confidence”. The subjects with low income ($\bar{x}=2.70$) and below middle perceived financial status ($\bar{x}=2.77$) had higher scores than middle ($\bar{x}=2.33$) and above middle perceived financial status ($\bar{x}=1.35$) on the factor of “F3- financial and communicational barriers”. The subjects with below middle perceived financial status ($\bar{x}=1.82$) had higher scores than middle perceived financial status ($\bar{x}=1.53$) on the factor “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”.

Table 4.32. *One-way ANOVA results for the factors by perceived financial status*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	4.108	3	1.369	75.865	198	.383	3.574	.015
F2	1.203	3	.401	89.662	198	.453	.885	NS
F3	17.009	3	5.670	121.962	198	.616	9.204	.000
F4	2.588	3	.863	133.670	198	.675	1.278	NS
F5	5.207	3	1.736	130.316	198	.658	2.637	NS
F6	3.254	3	1.085	66.006	198	.333	3.254	.023
F7	4.541	3	1.514	131.633	198	.665	2.277	NS
F8	.839	3	.280	39.853	198	.201	1.389	NS

Perceived SES. In terms of different perceived SES (low, below middle, middle, above middle, and high level), one-way ANOVA analysis indicated that there were found significant differences (at .001 to .020) on the factor of “F1- low self confidence”, “F3- financial and communicational barriers”, “F4- time

constraints”, and “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment” There were no significant differences between perceived SES on the scores of factors “F2- negative attitudes toward education”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, “F7- dissatisfaction from education”, “F8-unwillingness to participate” (Table 4.33).

The subjects with below middle perceived SES ($\bar{x}=1.74$) had significantly higher scores than the ones low ($\bar{x}=1.43$), middle ($\bar{x}=1.47$), and above middle ($\bar{x}=1.13$) perceived SES on the factor of “F1- low self confidence”. The subjects with low perceived SES ($\bar{x}=2.62$) had higher scores than ones above middle perceived SES ($\bar{x}=1.91$) and the subjects with below middle perceived SES ($\bar{x}=2.78$) have higher scores than ones middle ($\bar{x}=2.43$), and above middle perceived SES on the factor of “F3- financial and communicational barriers”. Subjects with above middle perceived SES ($\bar{x}=2.78$) had higher scores than ones below middle ($\bar{x}=2.10$) and middle ($\bar{x}=2.18$) perceived SES on the factor of “F4- time constraints”. The subjects with low perceived SES ($\bar{x}=1.69$) had higher scores than middle ($\bar{x}=1.57$) and above middle ($\bar{x}=1.45$) perceived SES on the factor “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment”.

Table 4.33. *One-way ANOVA results for the factors by perceived SES*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	6.234	3	2.078	73.738	198	.372	5.580	.001
F2	2.499	3	.833	88.365	198	.446	1.867	NS
F3	11.677	3	3.892	127.294	198	.643	6.054	.001
F4	6.598	3	2.199	129.660	198	.655	3.358	.020
F5	4.620	3	1.540	130.903	198	.661	2.329	NS
F6	3.571	3	1.190	65.689	198	.332	3.588	.015
F7	4.121	3	1.374	132.053	198	.667	2.059	NS
F8	.211	3	.070	40.481	198	.204	.344	NS

Place of Birth. One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to see for the difference between the regions (Black Sea, Eastern, Southeastern, and Central Anatolia) that the subjects were born in on the scores of each factor. Subjects who were born in Marmara, Aegean, and Mediterranean regions were not taken into consideration because there were only few subjects in these categories. There was no statistically significant difference between regions on the scores of each factor (Table 4.34).

Table 4.34. *One-way ANOVA for the place of birth on the factors*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	2.326	3	.775	72.714	182	.400	1.941	NS
F2	1.722	3	.574	81.136	182	.446	1.288	NS
F3	2.366	3	.789	126.743	182	.696	1.132	NS
F4	3.879	3	1.293	126.539	182	.695	1.860	NS
F5	3.026	3	1.009	121.770	182	.669	1.508	NS
F6	1.516	3	.505	62.768	182	.345	1.465	NS
F7	1.696	3	.565	114.400	182	.629	.899	NS
F8	.607	3	.202	37.389	182	.205	.985	NS

Reasons of Migration. One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to see the difference between the reasons of migration to İstanbul (economical, marriage, spouse's job, forced migration, education, appointment; by excluding security, health, relatives) on the scores of the factors. There were statistically significant differences between reasons of migration on the factors of "F3- financial and communicational barriers", "F4- time constraints", "F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses" (Table 4.35).

According to post hoc Scheffe multiple range procedure (at .1 alpha level), the subjects who migrated to İstanbul because of economical reasons ($\bar{x}=2.61$) and marriage ($\bar{x}=2.59$) had significantly higher scores than the subjects who migrated to

İstanbul because of appointment ($\bar{x}=1.38$) on the factor of “F3- financial and communicational barriers”. The subjects who migrated to İstanbul because of economical reasons ($\bar{x}=2.37$), forced migration ($\bar{x}=2.22$), and marriage ($\bar{x}=1.80$) had significantly higher scores than the subjects who migrated to İstanbul because of appointment ($\bar{x}=1.44$) on the factor of “F4- time constraints”. The subjects who migrated because of marriage ($\bar{x}=2.45$), had significantly higher scores than ones who mentioned the reasons of migration as economical reasons ($\bar{x}=1.88$), forced migration ($\bar{x}=1.43$) on the factor of “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”.

Table 4.35. *One-way ANOVA for the factors by the reasons of migration*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	4.227	5	.528	75.745	190	.392	1.346	NS
F2	4.366	5	.546	86.499	190	.448	1.218	NS
F3	10.226	5	2.045	124.245	190	.654	3.128	.010
F4	13.873	5	2.775	116.228	190	.612	4.536	.001
F5	11.381	5	2.276	120.917	190	.636	3.577	.004
F6	3.132	5	.391	66.128	190	.343	1.142	NS
F7	7.454	5	.932	128.720	190	.667	1.397	NS
F8	.702	5	.088	39.989	190	.207	.424	NS

Migration Time. One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to see the difference between the periods that the subjects migrated to İstanbul (1985-1989, 1990-1994, 1995-1999, and 2000-2004) on the scores of each factor. There was no statistically significant difference between the periods that the subjects migrated to İstanbul according to the factors (Table 4.36).

Table 4.36. *One-way ANOVA for the factors by migration time*

Factors	Between groups			Within groups			F_o	p
	SS	df	MS	SS	df	MS		
F1	1.995	3	.665	77.977	198	.394	1.689	NS
F2	.029	3	.010	90.835	198	.459	.021	NS
F3	1.707	3	.569	137.264	198	.693	.821	NS
F4	2.738	3	.913	133.520	198	.674	1.353	NS
F5	3.732	3	1.244	131.790	198	.666	1.869	NS
F6	.575	3	.192	68.685	198	.347	.552	NS
F7	1.931	3	.644	134.243	198	.678	.949	NS
F8	1.321	3	.440	39.371	198	.199	2.214	NS

Learning Experiences. T-test was carried out in order to see the difference between non-formal and/or informal learners and “non-learners” on the factors. Significant differences (at .001 to .052) were found on the factor of “F1- low self confidence”, “F2-negative attitudes towards education”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, and “F6-fear and hesitation regarding to environment”. Subjects who had an experience of non/informal learning scored higher than non-learners on the factors of “F1- low self confidence”, “F2-negative attitudes towards education”, “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, and “F6- fear and hesitation regarding to environment” (Table 4.37).

Table 4.37. *t-test results for the respondents of non-formal and/or informal learning on the factors*

Factors	Learning defined			Learning not defined			t_o	p
	n	\bar{x}	s	n	\bar{x}	s		
F1	124	1.59	.649	78	1.40	.586	4.398	.037
F2	124	1.71	.625	78	1.52	.731	3.835	.052
F3	124	2.60	.877	78	2.44	.748	1.836	NS
F4	124	2.14	.788	78	2.36	.866	-3.260	NS
F5	124	2.06	.819	78	1.67	.770	11.630	.001
F6	124	1.78	.610	78	1.50	.506	11.575	.001
F7	124	1.75	.875	78	1.30	.650	15.083	.000
F8	124	1.34	.504	78	1.16	.421	7.836	NS

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter begins with a summary and a discussion of the fieldwork findings and it continues with conclusion, limitations of the study, and some recommendations for further research.

The purposes of present field-work study were to analyze the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities of migrant adults, the non-formal and/or informal learning experiences, and also to explain the relationship between migrants' characteristics and their non-participation reasons.

5.1. Summary and Discussion

Population of the study was the headed household adults who were born outside of Istanbul in Turkey, migrated to the city between 1985 and 2004, and had not participated in any organized adult education activities during their lifespan.

Kağıthane with its four neighborhoods were identified purposefully to represent the squatter settlements in İstanbul. Headmen of these neighborhoods pinpointed streets where residents are mostly migrants of 1985 or after. A household was chosen randomly as a starting point in these streets, and then every second house was selected.

For the eligibility of the non-participation of each headed household adult in each selected household were asked whether they had ever participated in any adult education activities during their lifespan and migrated to the city between 1985 and 2004. If they have not participated in adult education activities and migrated to İstanbul in this specific period, provided that they accepted the interview, they were included within the sample after getting their informed consents. In order to secure

equal representation of both sexes, 35 male subjects were interviewed in coffee houses because it was hardly possible to find the male at home for the interview. At the end of the data collection period, 106 female and 96 male subjects were interviewed in Kağıthane sub-province.

5.1.1. Demographic Characteristics

Most of the migrants were 30 years old and older (65.3%), primary school graduates (56.4%), blue collar workers (35.1%) or housewives (34.7%), living in rented houses (63.67%), and from Black Sea region (33.2%). They migrated to İstanbul because of economical reasons (60.9%) between 1985 and 1994 (60.4%). Regarding the demographic characteristics of the migrant adults, majority of them were married (84.2%), and the married subjects had two children in average. Quite large proportion of mothers from different regions had a baby when they were younger than 15 years old. Among them a 22 years old female from Black Sea Region had a ten year-old biological child.

Researches show that migrants tend to move toward nearby towns and eventually they move to the most rapidly growing cities. However, most of the migrants participated in this study came directly to İstanbul (76.2%). Before 1985, major reasons of migration were caused by economical reasons. However, the reasons of migration became more complicated after 1985, and included economical, socio-cultural, and political reasons. In this research, economical reasons (60.9%), marriage (11.4%), forced migration and lack of security (8.4%), and spouses' job (6.4%) were frequently indicated as reasons of migration to İstanbul. For the female sample, spouses' job and marriage seems to be the main reasons for migration. One of the female sample from Black Sea region said that the girls in that region wait for

a man from the same area to marry, in order to live in a big city, which may mean that females do not have a crucial role in decision making process for migration.

According to the educational level, most of the subjects did not attend school after five-years of primary education (78.7%). There was a discrepancy regarding gender: 86.7 percent of the females and 69.8 percent of the males had less than six years of schooling. Second generation of migrants had better educational opportunities, but still 26.3 percent of them had less than six years of formal schooling (for females, 32.9%; for males 20.0%). Some of them did not benefit even from compulsory education which the state is required to provide all of its citizens as a basic constitutional right. Literature also shows that education equipped people political and economical voice in the society as a citizen. However, these migrants are voiceless people even though they live in the center of the biggest metropolitan city of Turkey, partly because of their low level of formal education. Low level of formal education causes un-employment and employment in either in informal sector or jobs in small business with low wage.

Findings about occupational statuses of migrants indicate that total number of un-employed male head of household was 22, and only two of them were single. Thus, among 170 married households, 20 male head of household were un-employed (11.8%), and among the employed ones majority of them were low paid blue collar workers. It is important to mention that migrants' educational and economical status were below the average level of İstanbul. However, migrant adults surprisingly perceived their families financial and SES as middle level.

5.1.2. Learning Experiences

In terms of non-formal and/or informal learning experiences, most of the subjects (61.4%) identified at least one learning area in İstanbul. Those who had such learning experiences are mostly female (60.5%), primary school graduates (53.2%), and less than 39 years old (79.8%). Responses related to non-formal and/or informal learning experiences were classified into nine learning areas as, job related learning, religious belief, skills related with women, socialization, city life, political awareness, Turkish language, learning on their own, and others.

Most of the subjects who stated “job related learning” were male (33.3%), within the range of 30-39 years old (42.5%), and primary school graduates (70.0%). As a part of informal learning, job related learning was the most frequently mentioned type of learning area, and many formal education programs are related with vocational training, as well as many non-formal education courses for job training and upgrading. Employment related informal trainings were provided for the new job entrants, not by the help of any organized educational activities, but the other experienced workmates. It is important to mention that migrants came to city because of better conditions and especially economical reasons. However, they generally work as blue collar workers, with low wages.

Most of the subjects who mentioned learning about “religious belief” were female (73.7%), less than 30 years old (73.7%), and did not attend any formal schooling, primary school dropouts and graduates (84.2%). Religious belief was one of the most frequently stated learning areas by those who were educated less than six years. These findings match with the literature. Related literature shows that religious belief is a way of protecting their cultural identity, and transmitting this to new generation. Işık and Pınarcıoğlu (2001) and Sociology Association (1993) found that,

nearly 50 percent of participants of any kind of course take part in Koran Course in squatter settlements. That indicates that one of the most demanded areas of learning either formal or non-formal is about religion in cities. In addition to Koran courses which are regulated by the MONE, some groups organize courses to teach Koran and the Muslim religion without any control of the State. One of the male subjects from East Anatolia indicated that members of a religious group helped him to find a job and then they invited him and his family to participate in the religious meetings of their group. This approach seems to be common to attract people to religious education. Even though “modern” city life necessitates secular people who can be more acceptable and tolerant towards “the others”, migrants are unqualified and without social support from state and democratic NGOs incline towards religious beliefs. It seems that this issue has two sides. First, religious groups help migrants in cities especially financially, and they are trying to include that their own religious groups. Second, migrants try to protect “their fatalistic Muslim and practical, folk-belief system” as a way of protecting their identity in city life.

Nearly half of the female learners mentioned that they learned to produce handicrafts either to save money or to support family financially from their close environment. Subjects who mentioned the “gendered skills related with women” were less than 39 years olds (82.9%), and did not attend any formal schooling, primary school dropouts and graduates (91.4%). This learning experience takes place and is practiced at home. This issue should be discussed from two perspectives. First, these less educated women who perceived their financial status as below middle try to support home financially. Women, who produce handicrafts, receive very little amount of money and do not have any social security. For example, a woman from Central Anatolia could earn only two New Turkish Liras a day by producing at most

three pieces of crafts. Secondly, they do not have any opportunity to change their life style or to communicate with “the others” as they could not leave their houses. Thus, women’s domestic roles remain. Although they produce for the public sphere and their labor has a value in the public sphere, they physically remain in the private sphere and cannot enjoy or benefits from the opportunities of the public sphere.

Adjustment to the “city life” was another frequently mentioned type of learning which takes place in İstanbul. There are important differences in human relations, daily life, and the way of coping with the problems in their original places and in İstanbul. They emphasize that they learned how to behave, communicate with others and cope with the economical problems from their immediate environment. On the other hand, in general migration and migrant population are perceived as a cause of the problems of İstanbul. Thus, migrants try to find a way to adopt in their new environment without any formal help from the public institutions.

Identified “Political awareness” in this study includes awareness about ethnic identity, religious identity, knowledge about dynamics of social and political developments in Turkey as well as abroad. They also express a need to find a way to help poor and under-educated neighbors. The source of this kind learning experience can either through political parties or NGOs that has political orientation. One of the forced migrant female subjects who was a primary school graduate in Southeastern Anatolia mentioned that she became aware of her ethnic identity in one of politically oriented NGOs; because she said she was dismissed from her job because of her ethnic identity in the first year of her migration to İstanbul. She after said she needed to learn her ethnic identity in detail and identify herself with it. Exclusion of people from social life because of their gender, ethnicity, religion, political identity or

economical status may cause either a need of “awareness” by the excluded people, or increase the probability of their involvement in “illegal or deviant” activities.

One of the most important tools for communication and to adjust to city life is language but, no formal institution exists to care about these people whose mother tongue is not Turkish. Some of the subjects had learned Turkish as a second language in İstanbul, and most of them did not attend any formal education before. A female subject who is 52 years old from Southeastern Anatolia, mentioned she learned Turkish in İstanbul, she had 11 children and three of them did not attend any formal education like their mother when they were in their birth place, due to nonexistence of school in their village. She added that as a result, they did not feel any necessity to learn Turkish, because they did not have any of basic state institutions like a health office or clinics in their village and in other closer villages which may necessitates speaking Turkish. Moreover if necessary, only males had interactions with State institutions.

“Learning on their own” by books, internet etc., was not mentioned frequently. Most of migrant adults do not read book and can not reach any source of distance learning. The recourses like neighborhood libraries are very limited, those available recourses for example happen to be about religion.

Only four female subjects who had at least one child, had information about child raring from a formal institution (local clinics) or a person (doctors) by demanding this information. The answers of migrants about non-formal and informal learning experiences show that migrant adults seek and define their learning needs without any assistance of formal institutions within their close environment.

5.1.3. Reasons of Non-participation

Factor analysis was carried out to determine the factors that affect migrant adults' non-participation in formal adult education activities. It was found that eight clusters of reasons or factors that effected non-participation in the adult education programs. The factors were: 1. low self-confidence, 2. negative attitudes toward education, 3. financial and communicational barriers, 4. time constraints, 5. family responsibility and familiarity with the courses, 6. fear and hesitation regarding the environment, 7. dissatisfaction from education, and 8. unwillingness to participate.

The factor analysis of RENOPAS in current research were not dramatically different from Kirazoğlu's (1996) eight factors, except "F7- dissatisfaction from educational activities", and "F8- unwillingness to participate". The contents of the factors however, showed some variations from Kirazoğlu's study. There were very close matches between three factors of the current study and Kirazoğlu's study: "F1- low self-confidence" and "F2-negative attitudes toward education" contained highly similar items having the Kirazoğlu's factors' items with the same name. Moreover, "F4- time constraints" factor loadings pointed to the same items. In previous research, "financial constraints", and "communicational barriers" were loaded as two different factors, whereas in the current factor analysis, same items were combined into one factor, namely "F3- financial and communicational barriers". In this study, "F5-family responsibility and familiarity with the courses" differed from Kirazoğlu's factor named "family responsibility" as the items related with the familiarity with the content and participants of the courses loaded in the same factors with items of family responsibility. In previous research, all the items related to "institutional barriers" were combined into the same factor, however, in the current research three items of this factor were loaded into "F6- fear and hesitation regarding to

environment”. “F7- dissatisfaction from educational activities” which was not observed in Kirazoğlu’s research, was considered as a part of “negative attitudes toward education” in the previous research. “F8- unwillingness to participate” was not observed in the previous research either.

In Kirazoğlu’s research, most influential demographic characteristics were age, which is related to six reasons of non-participation in adult education activities. Then come the educational level, marital status, number of children, occupational status, spouses’ occupational status, and perceived family status each associated with five factors. Then comes the gender related with three factors as one of the most influential demographic characteristics. Also, he found that the most important factor is financial constraints which influenced by different nine demographic characteristics, and least important factors is negative attitudes towards educational activities and institutional barriers which are affected by two demographic characteristics.

In current study, most influential demographic characteristics were occupational status which was related to seven factors. Then, educational level was the second influential characteristic which was related with six factors. Gender and learning experiences are the third effective characteristics which are related with five factors. The most important factors are financial and communicational barriers and low self confidence which influenced by nine different demographic characteristics among 13 characteristics, and then, the second important factor is time constraints which influenced eight demographic characteristics. The least important factors are unwillingness to participate (with zero demographic characteristics) and negative attitudes towards educational activities (with two demographic characteristics). According to this comparison, migrant adults’ reasons of non-participation in

organized adult education activities seem because of their financial status as a result of occupational status, and their low self-confidence. It seems that there is a circular relationship among low self-confidence, financial status and non-participation; low self-confidence and low level of financial status prevent participation in educational activities, and non-participation cause low self-confidence, and unqualified person with low wages. So, changes are needed in the nature of opportunities available for these disadvantaged adults; progress is necessary towards economic and social justice as well as increased educational level of the society.

Findings revealed that female subjects had lots of barriers in participating formal adult education activities. This can be due to the disadvantaged status of being female furthermore, being a migrant female in the society. “F5- family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”, and “F6- fear and hesitation regarding the environment” can be explained by the situation of migrant females in their environment. Migrants from the same village or region generally live very close to each others to protect themselves from the threat of the city life. This method of living with fellow countryman generates an informal control mechanism especially on women to prevent any change in their life style and make sure they function in defined roles as a mother or caregiver. If the factor of “F1- low self confidence” was taken into consideration, educational level of the females were lower than males and it could be understood that low level of education negatively effects participation in formal adult education activities. “F3- financial and communicational barriers” could have an effect on their self-confidence as well. Migrant women exist such a financial hardship that they struggle mostly to provide basic needs for their family. This factor (F3) also defines communicational barriers that females do not have or can not reach enough information about possible adult education activities and related institutions

could not serve females effectively. It was observed that most of the females perceived “courses” in relation to house and religion, such as embroidery, sewing, and Koran courses. They stated willingness to participate that kind of courses if they have opportunities and they motivate their daughters for “skills related with women” types of courses and/or Koran courses. however some of them mentioned that they do not want to join that kind of educational activities at all. One of the blue collar female worker said that she would like to send her daughter who is not a good student, to People’ Education Centers (PECs) vocational courses. Higher score of the males on the factor of “F4- time constraints” is not surprising since there were more male wage-workers when compared with the female in the sample.

In terms of age groups, older migrant adults had the lowest self confidence level, and for this group “low self-confidence” was more important as a non-participation reason. Some of the subjects who were less than 40 years old surprisingly stated they were old for participating educational activities. It could be perceived as a communicational barrier because they do not have enough information about the target age groups of the educational activities, and adult education institutions could not reach the adults. It is universally known that participation in adult education is very rare in older people. Research shows that most of the participants are middle classes and those with higher levels of educational attainment. Negative experience of education in childhood, and lack of resources are some reasons for non-participation in addition to other cultural and socio-economic factors.

Finding of the study demonstrates that married subjects had lower self esteem than single subjects, since most of the single subjects were male, that means married women had lower self esteem than single male and female, and married males.

Family obligations and responsibilities, to ask the permission from family members, and financial status of the whole family influenced the married female subjects negatively. Married women, who had five or more children, felt lower self esteem than others. For them, financial and communicational barriers constituted further reason for not participating adult education activities. Moreover, married females with children explained that they cannot find any place to take care of their children. On the other hand, subjects, who had no child had not satisfied from the courses. It could be due to the fact that subjects, this group had better educational level than others, and the fact that their expectations from educational activities were high.

Subjects who did not attend any formal schooling and primary school dropouts had the lowest level of self-confidence; they faced financial and communicational barriers; and they felt fear and hesitation regarding their immediate environment. The reason of this phenomenon may be the fact that the subjects with lower educational levels had relatively fewer years of formal schooling or no schooling and thus felt less confidence in their capabilities. They had to work in informal sector with low wages. Review of literature indicates that education helps people to raise political and economical voice. Most likely migrant adults, perceive lots of barriers for participating educational activities and unable to increase their political and economical voice. However, unemployed subjects scored on “F2-negative attitudes toward education” significantly higher than all other groups. Therefore, it can be concluded that unemployed migrants may not believe organized adult education activities would change their situation and help them find a job. This finding is crucial for especially public adult education institutions whose one of the aims to train or retrain people for a vocation.

According to occupational status, housewives had lower self confidence than the wage-workers. It is again related with the status of females in the society. Most of the females were unpaid house workers with lower formal schooling. The other reason for non-participation in organized educational activities for housewives was “family responsibility and familiarity with the courses”. The role of housewives in their home is defined as main caregiver for the family members, so their responsibility has priority than their personal development. Subjects who are blue collar workers did not have time for participating in educational activities especially during the week, and most of the public adult education activities do not have flexible schedule for them.

In terms of perceived family financial status and SES, subjects with low and below middle perceived financial status; had lower self confidence and they felt fear and hesitation regarding their immediate environment. Eventually, they stated financial and communicational problems as a reason for their non-participation.

According to the place of birth and migration time to İstanbul, there were no statistically significant differences on the factors related to reasons of non-participation in adult education. That may be because they share the common fundamental reasons of migration which is economical reasons. People migrated to İstanbul in different periods of time from different regions, but they were all economically deprived in their hometowns and they all share the same poor living conditions and problems in squatter settlements.

5.2. Conclusion

Finding of the present study are open to several conclusions. Migrant adults are less likely to be participating organized adult education activities due to different reasons. Some of the reasons related their own conditions and some of them derive from the institutional barriers. Especially public institutions are not successful to reach the needs of economically and educationally deprived migrant adults who constitute nearly half of the urban population. It can be concluded that public institutions do not serve them. Despite the fact that one of the most important missions of adult education is to help deprived population, for the purpose of reaching deprived adults to satisfy the need of adults, public adult education institutes should generate courses free of charge and any other expenses.

Females need special attention about the reasons of their non-participation in both formal and organized adult education activities. It necessitates that; education history of poor females should be taken into consideration for promoting effective programs for adults especially uneducated population.

It seems that migrant adults try to find or create their own learning environments which are non-formal or informal learning areas. These learning areas mainly help them acquire skills and knowledge for finding a job, supporting home economics, and/or to identifying themselves with their religious or ethnic identity in order not to be lost in a big city. In this aspect, organized adult education activities provided by public adult education institutions and NGOs become crucial to help migrants especially in the process of adjustment to the city life.

As a last conclusion, some important questions for adult educators as well as other social scientists could be put forward. What can be done to get rid of the migrant adults' barriers of non-participation in organized adult education activities?

Could non-formal and informal learning areas help migrants to solve their problems in city life? If not, what kind of educational activities can facilitate them in this process?

5.3. Limitations of the Study

One of the most important limitations of the study is its generalizability. Migrants scattered around İstanbul and it is too difficult to identify each one of them to use random sampling. Purposeful sampling does not present the population, but may provide some inside information.

Another limitation is caused by the characteristics of the RENOPAS which consist of 67 statements with four point Likert type scale. RENOPAS was developed for self-report, not for interview. During the interviews, sometimes it was difficult to implement RENOPAS. In the RENOPAS, some of the items are very similar in their content. People were less motivated to respond interview questions because of repetition of questions which can result in low reliability. During the data collection, some subjects rejected to take part in the interview. Their reasons for rejection were lack of time, misunderstanding the purpose of the interview, fear for to be interviewed, prejudice about effectiveness/ functions of these kinds of studies. These people could not be included the sample of the study that is also a limitation of generalizability of the results.

During the interview process, some subjects may have felt to answer questions according to “social desirability bias” which may happen. During an interview, people are likely to react in ways they believe are socially acceptable and wanted. For example, during the interviews, social desirability bias observed for occupational statuses. In the first day of interview a female subject answered the question of spouse’s occupation as blue collar worker, and then her husband said he

was unemployed but he had worked as a blue collar worker before. Being an unemployed person may perceive a fault of the person.

5.4. Recommendations for Further Researches

“Low self-confidence” and “financial and communicational barriers” were two main factors to explain the reasons of non-participation in adult education activities. It is recommended that the reasons of low self-confidence and communicational barriers should be taken into consideration in forthcoming researches and developing effective programs for disadvantaged groups in detail as well.

It is recommended the RENOPAS’s validity and reliability analyses should be done different population. Through, some items may be irrelevant and eliminated for the specific population.

In the current research factor analysis, t-test and one-way ANOVA were conducted to see the effects of demographic characteristics of the sample on the reasons of non-participation in organized adult education activities. For further explanations, some additional analysis would be used with different populations and larger sample.

There are a few numbers of researches about informal and non-formal learning experiences of different population. To explore why people choose that kind learning experiences instead of organized adult education activities and what kind of learning processes take place in informal learning, more studies should be carried out, and why people participate in these religious courses either bounded to MONE or illegal courses should be searched in detail.

Also, the research findings necessitate answering some questions for further researches: What can be done to get rid of the migrant adults' barriers of non-participation in organized adult education activities? Could non-formal and informal learning areas help migrants to solve their problems in city life? If not, what kind of educational activities can facilitate them in this process?

6. REFERENCES

- Akgüner, Ç. (1994). *Attitudes toward continuing education activities in Turkey*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.
- Akgür, Z. G. (1997). *Türkiye'de kırsal kesimden kente göç ve bölgeler arası dengesizlik (1970-1993)*. Ankara: Kültür Bakanlığı.
- Altunya, N. (1999). Eğitim hakkı. In F.Gök (ed.), *75 yılda eğitim* (p.79-89). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Arı, K. (1999). *Büyük mübadele. Türkiye'de zorunlu göç*, İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yurt Yayınları.
- Bal, H. (1997). Kentsel toplumda anomiyabancılaşıma olgusu kente göç edenlerin alternatif çözümü: Hemşehri birlikleri. *II. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi. Toplum ve Göç. 20-22 Mayıs 1997*. (p.431-440). Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.
- Bils, M. & Klenow, P. J. (2000). Does schooling cause growth?. *The American Economic Review* 90, 1160-1183.
- Boratav, K. (2000). İktisat tarihi (1908-1980). In S. Akşin (ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 4 Çağdaş Türkiye 1908-1980*. (p.297-379) İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.
- Boratav, K. (2000a). İktisat tarihi (1981-1994). In S. Akşin (ed.), *Türkiye Tarihi 5 Çağdaş Türkiye 1980-1995*. (p.159-210). İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.
- Çağlar, (1999). 75 yılda Cumhuriyet'in ilköğretim birikimi. In F.Gök (ed.), *75 yılda eğitim*. (p.125-144). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Çiftçi-Yeşiltuna, D. (1997). Hemşehri derneklerinin içerdiği iletişimin yapısı. *II. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi. Toplum ve Göç. 20-22 Mayıs 1997* (p.441-449). Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.

- Darkenwald, G. G. & Merriam, S. B. (1982). *Adult education: Foundation of practice*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Darkenwald, G. G. & Valentine, T. (1985). Factor structure of deterrents to public participation in adult education. *Adult Education Quarterly*. 35-4, 177-193.
- Değirmen, U. (2000). 1990'lardaki zorunlu göçün özgüllüğü, *Bilim ve Siyaset*, Sonbahar, 67-74.
- Deshingkar, P. & Grimm, S. (2005). *Internal migration and development: A global perspective*. International Organization for Migration (IOM), Geneva, Switzerland.
- DİE. (1993). *Genel nüfus sayımı: Nüfusun sosyal ve ekonomik nitelikleri*. Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.
- DİE. (1997). 1980-1985 ve 1985-1990 sayımlar arası dönemde Türkiye'de iç göçler. *II. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi. Toplum ve Göç. 20-22 Mayıs 1997*. (p.41-61). Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.
- DİE. (2000). *Unpublished results of 2000 census* from Ankara: DİE Research Center.
- English, L. M. (2000). Spiritual dimensions of informal learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 85, Spring, 29-38.
- Erder, S. (1996). *İstanbul'a bir kent konu: Ümraniye*, İstanbul: İletişim yayınları.
- Erman, T. (1998). Semi-public/ semi-private spaces in the experience of Turkish Migrant women in a squatter settlement. *Migration und Öffentlicher Raum. Stadtplanung werstattberichte. Stadtplanung Wien*. 40-50.
- Foley, G. (2004). Introduction: The state of adult education and learning. In G. Foley (ed.). *Dimensions of adult learning, adult education and training in a global era* (p.3-19). England: Open University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

- Freire, P. & Macado, D. (1987). *Literacy, reading the word and the world*, London: Critical Studies in Education Series, Bergin & Galvey.
- Gallacher, J., Crossan, B., Leahy, J., Merrill, B., & Field, J. (2000). *Education for all? further education, social inclusion and widening access*. Scotland: Centre for Research in Lifelong Learning.
- Güner-Alkış, N. (1993). *Gecekonduya yaşayan yetişkinlerin mesleki eğitim ihtiyaçları ve katılma engelleri*. İstanbul: Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Matbaası.
- İçduygu, A. & Sirkeci, İ. (1999). Cumhuriyet dönemi Türkiye’inde göç hareketleri. In O. Baydar (ed.) *75 Yılda köylerden şehirlere* (p.249-268). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- İçduygu, A. & Ünalın, T. (1997). Türkiye’de içgöç: sorunsal alanları ve araştırma yöntemleri, In A. İçduygu (ed.), *Türkiye’de İçgöç: Sorunsal Alanları ve Araştırma Yöntemleri Konferansı*,(p.38-55). İstanbul: Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı.
- Işık, O. & Pınarcıoğlu, M. M. (2001). *Nöbetleşe yoksulluk gecekondulaşma ve kent Yoksulları: Sultanbeyli örneği*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Jamieson, A., Miller, A. & Stafford, J. (1998). Education in a life course perspective: continuities and discontinuities. *Education and Aging*, 13-3, 213-228.
- Jenkins, A., Vignoles A., Wolf, A., & Galindo-Rueda, F. (2002). *The determinants and effects of lifelong learning*. London: Centre for the Economics of Education.
- Kabadayı, R. (1997). Kente gelenlerin eğitim ihtiyacı. *II. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi. Toplum ve Göç. 20-22 Mayıs 1997* (p.605-613). Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.

- Kadiođlu, A. (1997). Migration experiences of Turkish women: Notes from researcher's diary. *International Migration IOM*. 35-4. USA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 537-556.
- Keleş, R. (1982). Türkiye'de kentleşme ve kentsel gelişme politikaları. (prepared by T. Erder) *Kentsel bütünleşme*. (p.67-78). Ankara: Türkiye Geliştirme Araştırmaları Vakfı.
- Keleş, R. (1993). *Kent ve siyaset üzerine yazılar*, İstanbul: IULA-EMME.
- Kıray, M. & Abadan-Unat, N. (1985). Social structure. In *Sanderdruck aus Südosteuropa-Handbuch, Band IV, Türkei*, Vandenhoeck and Reprecht in Göttingen, 496-518.
- Kirazođlu, C. (1996). *Reasons for not participating in adult education activities*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.
- Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education. From pedagogy to androgogy*. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company.
- Kongar, E. (1976). *İmparatorluktan günümüze Türkiye'nin toplumsal yapısı*, Ankara: Cem Yayınları.
- Köymen, O. (1999). Cumhuriyet döneminde tarımsal yapı ve tarım politikaları. In O. Baydar (ed.) *75 Yılda köylerden şehirlere*, (p.1-21). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Kuhlman, T. (2000). Forced migration: an economist's perspective. *Faculteit der Economische Wetenschappen en Econometric, Serie Research Memoranda*, Retrieved January, 21, 2005 from <http://dare.unvu.vu.nl/1553/2000010.pdf>.
- Livingstone, D. W., Hart, D., & Davie, L. E. (2003). *Public Attitudes towards education in Ontario 2002, the 14th OIES/UT Survey*, Toronto: The Otrio Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto.

- Longworth, N. (2003). *Lifelong learning in action, transforming education in the 21st century*. London: London and Sterling.
- Marsick, V. C. & Watkins, K. E. (2001). Informal and incidental learning. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 89, Spring, 25-34.
- Massey, D. S., Arango, G. H., Kouaouci, A. P., & Taylor, J. E. (1993). Theories of international migration. a review and appraisal. *Population and Development Review*. 19-3, (36). 431-466.
- McGivney, V. (2001). Informal learning and bridging the class divide in educational participation, *Informal Learning, Rising East*, 4-2, 38-52.
- MEB. (2004). *Milli eğitim sayısal veriler 2003-2004*. Ankara
- Najar, B. N. (1976), *The dynamics of rural-urban migration and assimilation in Iraq*, Wayne State University, Unpublished Dissertation.
- Okçabol, R. (1996). *Halk eğitimi (Yetişkin eğitimi)*. İstanbul: Der yayınları.
- Okçabol, R. (2001). *Main areas, problems, and perspectives of continuing education*. Lunchterhand: European Manual of Continuing Education.
- Okçabol, R. (2005). *Türkiye eğitim sistemi*. Ankara: Ütopya Yayınları.
- Özbay, F. (1999). İstanbul'a göç ve il içi nüfus hareketleri (1985-1990). In O. Baydar (ed.) *75 yılda köylerden şehirlere* (p. 277-294). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Özbay, F., & Yücel, B. (2001). Türkiye'de göç hareketleri, devlet politikaları ve demografik yapı. *Nüfus ve Kalkınma- Göç, Eğitim, Demokrasi, Yaşam Kalitesi* (p.1-47). Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Bilimleri Enstitüsü.
- Peker, M. (1999). Türkiye'de içgöçün değişen yapısı. . In O. Baydar (ed.) *75 Yılda köylerden şehirlere* (p. 295-304). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Petersen, W. (1968). *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol.10, In D. L. Sills (eds.). The Macmillan Company & The Free Press.

- Ravenstein E. G. (1889, June). The Law of Migration I. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. LII.
- Richman, A. H. (1964). *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, In J. Gould, W.L. Kolb (eds.), Toronto: The Free Press of Glenceo.
- Roger, A. (1996). Teaching adults. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Sezal, İ. (2001). Türkiye’de eğitim ve nüfus: yapılar ve etkileşimler. *Nüfus ve Kalkınma: Göç, Eğitim, Demokrasi, Yaşam Kalitesi*. (p.69-95) Ankara: Hacettepe Üniversitesi Nüfus Etütleri Enstitüsü.
- Sirkeci, İ. (2002), Revisiting the Turkish migration to Germany after forty years, *Siirtolaisuus Migration*, (2), 9-20.
- Sosyoloji Derneği. (1993). *Gecekondularda ailelerarası geleneksel dayanışmanın çağdaş organizasyonlara dönüşümü*. Ankara: T.C. Başbakanlık Kadın ve Sosyal Hizmetler Müsteşarlığı Yayınları.
- Sönmez, M. (1994). *Grafiklerle 1990’larda İstanbul*. İstanbul Büyükşehir Belediyesi.
- Sönmez, M. (1996). *İstanbul’un iki yüzü 1980’den 2000’e değişim*. Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınları.
- Sönmez, M. (2002). *100 göstergede kriz ve yoksullaşma*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
- Tatlıdil, E. (1997). Hızlı kentleşmenin eğitim politikaları üzerine etkileri. *II. Ulusal Sosyoloji Kongresi. Toplum ve Göç. 20-22 Mayıs 1997*. (p.598-604). Ankara: Devlet İstatistik Enstitüsü Matbaası.
- UNESCO. (1979). *Terminology of Adult Education*. (prepared by C. Titmus, P. Buttedahl, D. Ironside). Paris: Lengrand..
- United Nations Conference on Human Settlements Habitat II. (1996). *Turkey national report and plan of Action*. İstanbul Habitat II.

- UNDP. (1996). *National development report*, Ankara: UNDP.
- Ural, O. (1993). *The reasons for participating in adult education programs in Turkey*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. İstanbul: Boğaziçi University.
- Ünlühisarcıklı, Ö., Kirazoğlu, C., & Okçabol, R. (1994). *The problems of internal migration and role of adult education*. Paper presented in European Research Seminar: Adult Education and Social Change, University of Helsinki in cooperation with University of Tampere, Lahdi.
- Ünlühisarcıklı, Ö. (1999). *Pathways to employment and vocational skill acquisition: apprentices, journeymen, and masters in the informal sector in İstanbul, Turkey*. University of Manchester. Unpublished Doctorate Thesis.
- Willis, P. (1997). *Learning to labor*, England: Saxon House.
- Zarakoğlu, R. (2000). Göçün sürekliliği olgusunun sosyo-ekonomik ve politik sonuçları, *Bilim ve Siyaset*, Sonbahar, 8-11.

APPENDIX A

**Reasons for Non-participation Scale (RENOPAS) with the
Demographic Information Form of Current Research**

YETİŞKİNLERİN EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA

NEDENLERİ

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİLER

1. Cinsiyet Kadın Erkek
2. Yaşınız:
 14-19 20-24 25-29 30-39 40-49 50 yaş ve üstü
3. Doğum Yeriniz Bölge:
4. Medeni Durumunuz Evli Bekar Boşanmış Eşi vefat etmiş
5. Çocuğunuz var mı? Kaç tane?
 yok 1 tane 2 tane 3 tane 4 tane 5 ve daha fazla
6. Çocukların büyükten küçüğe doğru

Çocuk Sayısı	Cinsiyeti	Yaşı	Şu anki Eğitim Durumu
1. Çocuk			
2. Çocuk			
3. Çocuk			
4. Çocuk			
5. Çocuk			

7. Ne iş yapıyorsunuz?(işsizseniz ya da ev kadınıysanız, işsiz ya da ev kadını diye yazınız)

.....

8. Eşiniz ne iş yapıyor?(işsizse ya da ev kadınıysa, işsiz ya da ev kadını diye yazınız)

.....

9. Kendi Eğitim Durumunuz:

<input type="checkbox"/> Hiç gitmemiş	
<input type="checkbox"/> İlkokul Mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> İlkokuldan terk
<input type="checkbox"/> Ortaokul Mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> Ortaokuldan terk
<input type="checkbox"/> Meslek ok. orta kısmı mez.	<input type="checkbox"/> Meslek ortaokulundan terk
<input type="checkbox"/> Lise mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> Liseden terk
<input type="checkbox"/> Meslek lisesi mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> Meslek Lisesinden terk
<input type="checkbox"/> Yüksekokul mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> Yüksekokuldan terk
<input type="checkbox"/> Üniversite mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> Üniversiteden terk
<input type="checkbox"/> Lisansüstü	

10. Oturduğunuz ev sizin mi?

Evet Hayır, kirada oturuyoruz.

11. (Bu soru ev sahibiyse sorulacak) Başka sahip olduğunuz ev var mı?

Evet Hayır

12. Ailenizin maddi durumunu nasıl görüyorsunuz?

Dar gelirli Ortanın altında Orta Ortanın üstünde Yüksek gelirli

13. Yaptığınız işi, öğrenim durumunuzu, yaşadığınız semti ve gelir düzeyinizi düşünecek olursanız, toplumdaki yerinizi nasıl görüyorsunuz?

Alt düzey Ortanın altında Orta Ortanın üstünde üst düzey

GÖÇE İLİŞKİN SORULAR

Doğumunuzdan itibaren taşıdığınız-yerleştiğiniz yerler:

14. Memleketinizden göç etme nedenleriniz nelerdi?

Ekonomik nedenler	()
Zorunlu göç	()
Bulunulan yerin doğal koşulları (deprem, toprak kayması gibi)	()
Eğitim	()
Sağlık	()
Dinsel nedenler	()
Güvenlik sorunları- savaş koşulları	()
Memuriyette tayin (kendisi)	()
Eşin/ aile reisinin tayini, iş bulması	()
Evlilik	()
Diğer:	

15. Son olarak İstanbul'a göç etme nedenleriniz nelerdi?

Ekonomik nedenler	()
Zorunlu göç	()
Bulunulan yerin doğal koşulları (deprem, toprak kayması gibi)	()
Eğitim	()
Sağlık	()
Dinsel nedenler	()
Güvenlik sorunları- savaş koşulları	()
Memuriyette tayin (kendisi)	()
Eşin/ aile reisinin tayini, iş bulması	()
Evlilik	()
Diğer:	

16. Kaç yıldır İstanbul'dasınız?

17. Hepimiz eğitim kurumları dışında da sürekli bir şeyler öğreniriz. İstanbul'a geldikten sonra tek başınıza, bir grup insanla (komşularınız, hemşerileriniz, aynı inanişta olduğunuz kişilerle) size maddi manevi katkı sağlayan bir konuda yeni bir şeyler öğrendiniz mi?

() Evet

() Hayır

Evet ise, neler?

2. Bölüm

Bu bölümde de okul dışındaki eğitim öğretim etkinliğine katılmaya engel olan nedenler cümleler halinde verilmiştir.

Sizden istenen, her nedenin sizin için ne kadar doğru olduğunu belirtmenizdir. Bunun için her nedeni dikkatle okuyup karşısında parantez içinde 1’den 4’e kadar yer alan dayılardan birini işaretlemeniz gerekmektedir.

1’den 4’e kadar yer alan sayıların anlamı:

(1) Bu neden benim için **hiç doğru değil.**

(2) Bu neden benim için **biraz doğru.**

(3) Bu neden benim için **oldukça doğru.**

(4) Bu neden benim için **çok doğru.**

Yetişkin eğitimi etkinliklerine katılmama nedenleri	Hiç doğru değil	Biraz doğru	Oldukça doğru	Çok doğru
1. Kursa katılacak zamanım <u>olmadığı</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2. Kurs için gerekli harcamaları karşılayamayacağım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
3. Bu kurslardaki öğretmenleri pek fazla tanımadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
4. Çocukları bırakacak yer bulamadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
5. Kursa gitmeme eşim izin <u>vermediği</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
6. Kurs öğretmenlerinin kursiyerlere iyi davranmadığını duymuştum	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
7. Öğrenme yeteneğime güvenemediğim için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
8. Verilen dersleri kafamın <u>almayacağı</u> mı düşündüğüm için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
9. Kurslara katılmaya ilgi <u>duymadığım</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
10. Kurslara katılmayı gereksiz bulduğum için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
11. Mevcut kursları düzenleyen kurumların nitelikli olduğuna <u>inanmadığım</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
12. Eğitimin bana işimde/mesleğimde yardımcı olacağına <u>inanmadığım</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
13. Zamanımın çoğunu ailemle birlikte geçirmek istediğim için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
14. Mevcut yetişkin eğitimi kursları hakkında bilgim <u>olmadığı</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
15. Genç öğrencilerle rekabet edemeyeceğimi düşündüğüm için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
16. İlgi duyduğum konularda kurs bulamadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
17. Kursların bana bir imkan sağlayacağına <u>inanmadığım</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
18. Rahatça gidebileceğim bir yerde kurs <u>olmadığı</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
19. Bu kurslara ne tür insanların gittiğini <u>bilmediğim</u> için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Yetişkin eğitimi etkinliklerine katılmama nedenleri	Hiç doğru değil	Biraz doğru	Oldukça doğru	Çok doğru
20. Yaşlı olduğum için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
21. Bir kursu bitirmemin iş bulmamda yardımcı olacağına inanmadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
22. Çevremde açılan kurslarla ilgili duyurulara hiç rastlamadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
23. Ailem izin vermediği için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
24. İş yerinde çok yorulduğum için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
25. Zaten çok az olan boş zamanımı harcamak istemediğim için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
26. Benim öğrenim düzeyim çok düşük olduğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
27. Kurslara düzenli bir şekilde katılabilecek kadar zamanım olmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
28. Kurslar ihtiyacımıza cevap verebilecek düzeyde olmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
29. Kursu birlikte gidecek insan bulamadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
30. Bu kurslarda neler yapıldığını bilmediğim için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
31. Ek bir işte çalıştığım için zamanım yok	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
32. Ailem parasal destekte bulunmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
33. Geçim sıkıntısı daha ağır bastığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
34. Kurslar pahalı olduğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
35. Sınıf içinde, herkesin ortasında, bana sorulacak soruları cevaplamak istemezdim	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
36. Kursta başarısız olmaktan korktuğum için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
37. Sıkılacağımı düşündüğüm için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
38. Kurslarda yer bulamadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
39. Çalıştığım iş yerinde yerime bakacak kimse olmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
40. Ailemle ilgilenmem gerektiği için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
41. Kurslara benim kadar yaşlı insanlar pek gitmediği için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
42. Kursların zor olduğunu düşündüğüm için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
43. Kurslara katıldığımda çevremdekilerin bana geleceğini düşündüğüm için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
44. Tembel biri olduğumu düşündüğüm için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
45. Kursları düzenleyen kuruluşlar hakkında bilgim olmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
46. Kursu gidersem benim cahil olduğumu düşünürler	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
47. Ulaşım masrafları çok tuttuğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
48. Kurslara katılmanın benim gelirim artmasına faydası olacağına inanmadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
49. Kursları bitirmek uzun sürdüğü için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
50. Evdeki işlerden zaman bulamadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Yetişkin eğitimi etkinliklerine katılmama nedenleri	Hiç doğru değil	Biraz doğru	Oldukça doğru	Çok doğru
51. İstedğim konuda kurs açılmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
52. Kursa gitmeme kaynanam izin vermediği için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
53. İş yerimden izin alamadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
54. Maddi gücüm yetersiz olduğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
55. Çalıştığım iş yerinde işler çok yoğun olduğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
56. Sağlığım bozuk olduğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
57. Öğrendiklerimi çabuk unuttuğum için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
58. Okuma yazmam zayıf olduğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
59. Açılan kurslardan haberim olmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
60. Bir eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılma ihtiyacı duymadığım için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
61. Yeni şeyler öğrenmek zor geldiği için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
62. Yabancı bir ortama girmekten çekindiğim için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
63. Böyle şeylere ayıracak zamanım olmadığı için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
64. Böyle şeyler para kazandırmaz	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
65. Kurs öğretmeni karşı cinsten olabileceği için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
66. Kurs saatleri uzun sürdüğü için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
67. Ulaşım zor olduğu için	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

APPENDIX B

Additional Demographic Information About the Sample

Appendix B1. *The subjects' age groups by migration time*

Age Group	Migration Time								Total	
	1985-1989		1990-1994		1995-1999		2000-2004		f	%
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Less than 25	3	4.5	5	9.1	6	12.5	8	25.0	22	10.9
25-29	8	11.9	19	34.5	14	29.2	7	21.9	48	23.8
30-39	27	40.3	19	34.5	24	50.0	9	28.1	79	39.1
40-49	25	37.3	9	16.4	2	4.2	5	15.6	41	20.3
50-	4	6.0	3	5.5	2	4.2	3	9.4	12	5.9
Total	67	100	55	100	48	100	32	100	202	100

Appendix B2. *The subjects' educational level by gender*

Educational Level	Gender				Total	
	Female		Male		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
Not attended any formal schooling	24	22.6	4	4.2	28	13.9
Primary school dropouts	14	13.2	3	3.1	17	8.4
Primary school graduate	51	48.1	56	58.3	107	53.0
Junior high school dropouts	3	2.8	4	4.2	7	3.5
Junior high school graduate	2	1.9	5	5.2	7	3.5
High school dropouts	1	0.9	3	3.1	4	2.0
High school graduate	4	3.8	12	12.5	16	7.9
Higher ed. institutions dropouts	1	0.9	1	1.0	2	1.0
Graduates of higher ed. institutions	6	5.7	8	8.3	14	6.9
Total	106	100	96	100	202	100

Appendix B3. *Educational level of migrants' children according to gender*

Educational Level	Sex				Total	
	Female		Male		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
Not attended any formal schooling	12	7.7	1	0.6	13	4.1
Primary school dropouts	4	2.6	5	3.0	9	2.8
Primary school graduate (compulsory 5 year)	35	22.6	27	16.4	62	19.4
Attending primary school (compulsory 8 years)	48	31.0	62	37.6	110	34.4
Secondary school dropouts	2	1.3	2	1.2	4	1.3
Secondary school graduate	11	7.1	12	7.3	23	7.2
Attending high school	14	9.0	8	4.8	22	6.9
High school dropouts	1	0.6	2	1.2	3	0.9
High school graduate	8	5.2	19	11.5	27	8.4
Graduates of higher educational institutions and dropouts	11	7.1	15	9.1	26	8.1
Missing	9	5.8	12	7.3	21	6.6
Total	155	100	165	100	320	100

* 125 of children of migrants were between 0 and 7 years old who were not attending school yet.

Appendix B4. *Migration time of non-participant migrants by gender*

Migration Time	House Ownership				Total	
	Owner		Rental		f	%
	f	%	f	%		
1985-1989	34	45.9	33	25.8	67	33.2
1990-1994	23	31.1	32	25.0	55	27.2
1995-1999	12	16.2	36	28.1	48	23.8
2000-2004	5	6.8	27	21.1	32	15.8
Total	74	100	128	100	202	100

Appendix B5. *Migration time according to the region that they were born in.*

Region	Migration Date							
	1985-1989		1990-1994		1995-1999		2000-2004	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Eastern Anatolia	23	34.3	13	23.6	11	22.9	8	25.0
South Eastern Anatolia	10	14.9	13	23.6	9	18.8	10	31.3
Black Sea	26	38.8	18	32.7	17	35.4	6	18.8
Central Anatolia	4	6.0	8	14.5	7	14.6	3	9.4
Aegean	0	0.0	1	1.8	4	8.3	2	6.3
Mediterranean	1	1.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	6.3
Marmara	3	4.5	2	3.6	0	0.0	1	3.1
Total	76	100	60	100	42	100	24	100

Appendix B6. *Additional demographic characteristics of respondents non-formal and/or informal learning*

Demographic Characteristics		Learning Experience		
		Total	f	%
Marital Status	Single	25	20	80.0
	Married	170	100	58.8
	Divorced	3	2	80.0
	Widow	4	2	50.0
Number of children	No child	37	31	83.8
	One	25	13	52.0
	Two	57	37	64.9
	Three	39	20	51.3
	Four	25	13	52.0
	Five and more	19	10	52.6
Occupational Status	Blue collar worker	71	43	60.6
	White collar worker	17	13	76.5
	Entrepreneur	12	4	33.3
	Housewife (working at home)	13	11	84.6
	Housewife	70	44	62.9
	Retired	11	5	45.5
	Unemployed	8	4	50.0
House Ownership	House owner	74	41	55.4
	Rental	128	83	64.8
Financial Status	Low level	49	31	63.3
	Below middle level	67	39	58.2
	Middle level	80	49	61.3
	Above middle level	6	5	83.3
Perceived SES	Low level	40	22	55.0
	Below middle level	64	37	57.8
	Middle level	81	53	65.4
	Above middle level	17	12	70.6
The region	Black Sea Region	67	41	61.2
	Eastern Anatolia Region	55	33	60.0
	South Eastern Anatolia	42	23	54.8
	Central Anatolia Region	22	13	59.1
	Aegean Region	7	5	71.4
	Marmara Region	3	3	100
	Mediterranean Region	6	6	100
Migration Reasons	Economical reasons	123	74	60.2
	Marriage	23	17	73.9
	Spouse's job	13	7	53.8
	Forced migration	13	6	46.2
	Security	4	2	50.0
	Education	13	8	61.5
	Health	4	2	50.0
	Appointment	7	7	100
	Relatives in İstanbul	2	1	50.0
Migration Time	1985-1989	67	38	56.7
	1990-1994	55	39	70.9
	1995-1999	48	29	60.4
	2000-2004	32	18	56.3

APPENDIX C

Rotated Factor Matrix of 16 Factors

Item No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
62	.763							
26	.729							
36	.709						.306	
58	.700							
35	.689				.273		.300	
41	.683							
19	.673							
61	.641	.244						
32	.628				.240			.274
42	.618	.253						
23	.618					.238		
65	.613					.214		
15	.605					.227		
45	.601			.201	.229			
20	.592							
8	.577							
3	.566					.228		
34	.560		.356					
7	.556							
52	.530							
59	.517		.332				.265	
43	.513						.275	.217
5	.510					.202		
66	.506		.218					
14	.504		.229				.256	
30	.489			.236	.214		.328	
18	.482			.313				
47	.481		.380					
48	.470	.470		.206				
67	.439		.303	.201				
54	.431		.362					
22	.429		.283					
13	.413			.378			.227	
49	.410	.275		.236				
46	.398							.393
56	.374							
2	.363		.271					.225
12	.311	.580						
17	.457	.575						
11	.339	.572		.247				
9	.455	.547						
10	.436	.542						
40	.436			.305		.256		
64		.476					.212	
21	.469	.471						.216
28		.448		.276	.284			
16		.439		.317	.423			
60	.421	.437					.217	
4	.408			.355				

Item No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
6		.379						
24		.209	.746					
53			.732		.240			
55		.334	.703					
39		.204	.649					
25		.424	.588			.350		
27	.204		.525			.366		
1			.508			.270		
33	.377		.462					.228
63			.414			.307	.271	
57	.517							
50	.390			.471		.212		
51		.324		.310	.504			
37	.263	.403					.407	.333
38								.627
44	.315				.240			
29	.385							
31			.357		.275			

Item No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
62								
26								
36								
58								
35								
41								
19					.296			
61							.214	
32								
42								
23								
65			.250					
15								
45								
20								.229
8	.213							
3					.228			
34								
7	.227							
52			.314					
59								
43			.212					
5			.328					
66	.299						.221	
14								
30					.315			

Item No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
18								
47								
48			.271			.205		
67	.297						.201	
54								
22								
13								
49	.311							
46				.331	.202			
56	.336	.253			.299			.308
2		.214						
12								.222
17			-.233					
11								
9								
10								
40								
64								
21						.257		
28	.283	.319		.237				
16		.226		.205				
60								
4							.217	
6		.297	.259					
24								
53								
55								
39								
25								
27		.224						
1	.225							
33				.238				
63		.239						
57		.235					.228	
50								
51		.221						
37		.240						
38								.387
44	.369			.326				
29					.402		.278	
31				.229		.414	.250	.248

APPENDIX D

Extracted Factor Matrix of Eight Factors

Item No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
8	.818							
7	.743							
57	.710		.209					
20	.687					.213		
41	.667					.239		
15	.632					.259		
36	.616		.221		.288			.330
58	.593		.241		.302			
26	.582				.234	.347		
61	.576	.399				.285		
35	.553		.245		.239		.284	.375
62	.551		.220		.210	.357		.230
43	.535							.375
56	.457							
44	.231						.225	
17		.739						
48		.738						
12		.734						
64		.684						
21		.680				.276		
10	.291	.650						
9	.362	.564					.332	
11		.562				.212	.438	
60	.375	.560						
42	.401	.527						
54			.714					
47			.703			.359		
22			.659		.243			
59	.243		.650		.315			
34	.242		.635			.201		.213
33			.613					.254
14	.234		.562		.290			
2			.541					.203
45	.254		.534		.248		.314	
67			.528			.420		
18			.480		.353			
32	.244		.411		.240	.370		.392
24				.816				
55				.790				
53				.775				
25		.266		.749				
39				.747				
27		.231		.534	.321			
1				.482				
31				.429				
63		.244		.418	.414			
50					.749	.223		
40			.235		.700	.215		
4					.661			

Item No.	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7	Factor 8
13					.610			
30			.434		.444		.211	.225
29	.269		.316		.389			
19	.363		.209		.385	.304	.268	
52	.252					.649		
23	.318				.375	.536		
65	.374				.254	.511		
3	.386					.500		
5	.231				.362	.483		
49		.428				.465		
66		.366	.242			.394		
51							.699	
16		.225					.677	
28		.281					.516	
38								.635
46	.317							.471
37		.434					.201	.446
6		.301					.240	

APPENDIX E

**Content Comparisons of Between Factors Finding of Kirazođlu and
Current Study**

Factor 1- Low self-confidence	Kirazoğlu's Factor
8. Because I think I won't understand the lectures given	Low self-confidence
7. Because I don't have confidence in my learning abilities	Low self-confidence
57. Because I forget what I have learned very easily	Low self-confidence
20. Because I am old	Low self-confidence
41. Because people who are as old as me do not usually attend courses	Low self-confidence
15. Because I can't compete with younger students	Communicational barriers
36. Because I am afraid of being unsuccessful in the courses	Low self-confidence
58. Because my reading and writing skills are not adequate	Low self-confidence
26. Because my education is very poor	Low self-confidence
61. Because learning new things is difficult	Low self-confidence
35. I wouldn't like to answer questions in front of everybody in class	Low self-confidence
62. Because I feel shy in an unfamiliar environment	Low self-confidence
43. Because I think people around me would laugh at me if I participated in courses	Low self-confidence
56. Because I am not healthy	Low self-confidence
Factor 2- Negative attitudes toward education	Kirazoğlu's Factor
17. Because I don't believe the courses would provide me with opportunities	Negative attitudes toward education
48. Because I don't believe participating in courses would help increase my income	Negative attitudes toward education
12. Because I don't believe training would help me in my job/profession	Negative attitudes toward education
64. Such things do not cause earn money	Negative attitudes toward education
21. Because I don't believe completing a course would help me in finding a job	Negative attitudes toward education
10. Because I find it unnecessary to participate in courses	Negative attitudes toward education
9. Because I am not interested in taking courses	Negative attitudes toward education
11. Because I don't believe the institutions organizing available courses are qualified	Negative attitudes toward education
60. Because I see no necessity for participating in a learning activity	Negative attitudes toward education
42. Because I think the courses are difficult	Low self-confidence
6. I have heard that the course instructors do not treat the course participants well	Institutional barriers
Factor 3- Financial and communicational barriers	Kirazoğlu's Factor
54. Because I am not financially sufficient	Financial constraints
47. Because the transportation expenses are very high	Financial constraints
22. Because I have never seen any advertisement about the courses opened in my environment	Communicational barriers
59. Because I haven't heard about the courses offered	Communicational barriers
34. Because courses are very expensive	Financial constraints
33. Because earning a living is greater trouble	Financial constraints
14. Because I don't have information about the available adult education courses	Communicational barriers
2. Because I think I can't afford the expenses necessary for the courses	Financial constraints
45. Because I don't have information about the institutions organizing the courses	Communicational barriers
67. Because transportation is very difficult	Financial constraints
18. Because the courses are at inconvenient locations	Institutional barriers
32. Because my family did not support me financially	Financial constraints

Factor 4- Time constraints	Kirazoğlu's Factor
24. Because I get tired at work	Time constraints
55. Because where I work it is very busy	Time constraints
53. Because I can't get permission from the work place	Time constraints
25. Because I don't want to waste my time that is already very limited	Time constraints
39. Because there is nobody to take care my job at work	Time constraints
27. Because I don't have enough time for participating in courses regularly	Time constraints
1. Because I don't have the time for participation	Time constraints
31. I have no time because I have another job	Time constraints
63. Because I have no extra time for such things	Time constraints
Factor 5- Family responsibility and familiarity with the courses	Kirazoğlu's Factor
50. Because I can't find time because of housework	Family responsibility
40. Because I have to take care of my family	Family responsibility
4. Because it is difficult for me to find any place to leave my children to be taken care of	Family responsibility
13. Because I want to spend most of my time with my family	Family responsibility
30. Because I don't know what is going on in these courses	Communicational
29. Because I can't find anybody to attend courses together with me	Low Self-confidence
19. Because I don't know what kind of people attend such courses	Communicational
Factor 6- Fear and hesitation regarding the environment	Kirazoğlu's Factor
52. Because my mother-in law- don't allow me to participate	Fear and hesitation
23. Because my family did not allow me	Fear and hesitation
65. Because the course instructor would be of the other sex	Fear and hesitation
3. Because I don't know the instructors in those courses well enough	Institutional barriers
5. Because my spouse don't allow me to participate	Fear and hesitation
49. Because it takes too long to finish the courses	Institutional barriers
66. Because course hours last too long	Institutional barriers
Factor 7- Dissatisfaction from educational activities	Kirazoğlu's Factor
51. Because no courses are offered I have desired	Negative attitudes toward education
16. Because I can't find any courses on subjects that I am interested in	Negative attitudes toward education
28. Because the courses are not sufficient for satisfying our needs	Negative attitudes toward education
Factor 8- Unwillingness to Participate	Kirazoğlu's Factor
38. Because I can't usually find place in the courses	Fear and hesitation
46. If I take a course people would think that I am ignorant	Low self-confidence
37. Because I think I would be bored	Low self-confidence

APPENDIX F

Mean and Standard Deviation of the Items in the RENOPAS

Item	\bar{x}	sd
1	3.01	1.254
2	3.02	1.242
3	1.53	.926
4	1.84	1.237
5	1.51	1.052
6	1.14	.435
7	1.44	.785
8	1.49	.806
9	1.86	1.108
10	1.59	.995
11	1.53	.952
12	1.69	1.063
13	1.79	1.133
14	2.56	1.342
15	1.42	.862
16	1.61	1.065
17	1.84	1.174
18	2.32	1.285
19	1.76	1.099
20	1.53	1.008
21	1.81	1.114
22	2.62	1.322
23	1.55	1.097
24	2.24	1.362
25	2.20	1.258
26	1.79	1.176
27	2.99	1.254
28	1.55	1.002
29	1.85	1.114
30	1.78	1.103
31	1.35	.846
32	1.89	1.251
33	3.11	1.196
34	2.53	1.294
35	1.55	.930
36	1.49	.818
37	1.45	.834
38	1.11	.526
39	1.92	1.294
40	2.44	1.338

Item	\bar{x}	sd
41	1.50	.932
42	1.46	.847
43	1.20	.576
44	1.08	.351
45	2.09	1.243
46	1.26	.666
47	2.42	1.228
48	1.81	1.090
49	1.82	1.026
50	1.90	1.266
51	1.57	1.026
52	1.35	.828
53	1.77	1.200
54	2.84	1.269
55	2.09	1.318
56	1.42	.901
57	1.39	.753
58	1.77	1.171
59	2.55	1.285
60	1.74	1.028
61	1.55	.881
62	1.71	1.011
63	2.45	1.281
64	1.48	.942
65	1.45	.909
66	2.05	1.149
67	2.50	1.243