# REASONS FOR NOT PARTICIPATING IN ADULT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

CEM KIRAZOGLU

BOGAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

1996

# Reasons for not Participating in Adult Education Activities

Thesis submitted to the

Institute of Social Sciences

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Educational Sciences



by

Cem Kirazoğlu

Boğaziçi University

1996

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would be impossible without the support of my thesis advisor Prof. Dr. Rıfat Okçabol. He let me free in deciding on the subject and methodology of my thesis, which is a characteristic necessary for free science.

I would also like to thank to my committee member Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sevda Bekman who gave me emotional support for completing this thesis. Her recommendations helped me for making some important decisions.

I am grateful to my committee member Assist. Prof. Dr. Deniz Albayrak-Kaymak for the time she devoted to, and great care and attention she showed for this study.

I would thank especially to the people for their patience, who have accepted to participate in this study as a subject during all of the data collection stages.

I am also grateful to my interviewers Tülay Suiçmez, Emine Akalın and other interviewers who have collected data for this study and especially to Gülay Erdem, one of the interviewers, who helped me to keep up my hopes.

I would also thank to Süheyla Zubaroğlu and BÜREM who let me to use their computer facilities for factor analyses.

My special thanks go to Gülcan Erçetin for helping me in translation of RENOPAS items into English and gave me emotional support for completing this thesis. She also helped me in giving recommendations during development of interview forms. At that process I am also grateful to Özlem

Ünlühisarcıklı and Yakut Gazi-Demirci for giving valuable ideas and for their emotional support as well.

I am also grateful to my family and all of my close friends for their emotional support.

# ABSTRACT

Reasons for not Participating in Adult Education Activities

by

Cem Kirazoğlu

The purpose of the study was to develop a valid and reliable instrument for identifying the adults' reasons and the magnitude of each reason for not participating in adult education activities. It was realized through five steps and the instrument was named "Reasons for Non-participation Scale (RENOPAS)".

In the first three steps items were generated through the review of related literature; interviews made with 20 non-participants and with 25 people who work in the field of adult education.

In the fourth step, for the content validation of the instrument the third form of RENOPAS and the factors of situational, institutional, informational, and psychosocial barriers with their conceptual definitions, were given to a group of 25 judges.

In the fifth step, for the reliability and construct validation of the instrument the fourth form of RENOPAS were

administered to 325 nonparticipants. It consisted of two parts. The questions in the first part were related with some demographic characteristics. The second part of RENOPAS included 74 4-point Likert type items indicating the reasons for non-participation.

For the reliability of the entire instrument, Cronbach alpha and item-total statistics were calculated. Cronbach alpha was found as .9323.

For the construct validity of the instrument, factor analysis was carried out and 15 factors were extracted. These factors were found to be consistent with the classification of the judges. Then, the number of these factors were decreased to 8 and named as financial constraints, negative attitude towards educational activities, time constraints, fear and hesitation regarding the environment, low self-confidence, communicational barriers, family responsibility and institutional barriers.

Scale level reliability analysis was also carried out and its results were found satisfactory. Each of the 8 scales except one had high and very high reliability coefficients.

When factors were analyzed in relation to demographic characteristics, which various relationships were found. RENOPAS was found being very reliable and valid. It can be used for identifying the reasons for non-participation and their magnitudes. There were similarities between studies done in Türkiye and foreign countries, and also culture specific characteristics.

# ÖZET

Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri

Cem Kirazoğlu

Bu çalışmanın amacı yetişkinlerin yetişkin eğitimi etkinliklerine katılmama nedenlerini ve bu nedenlerin önem derecesini saptamaya yönelik geçerli ve güvenilir bir araç geliştirmektir. Bu amaç 5 aşamada gerçekleştirilmiştir ve araca "Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri Ölçeği (YEETKANÖ)" adı verilmiştir.

Çalışmanın ilk üç aşamasında kaynaklar taranarak ve hiç bir yetişkin eğitimi etkinliğine katılmamış olan 20 ve yetişkin eğitimi alanında çalışan 25 kişiyle görüşülerek maddeler üretilmiştir.

İçerik geçerliliğinin sınandığı dördüncü aşamada, YEETKANÖ'nün üçüncü şekli, kaynak taraması sonucunda saptanan durumsal, kurumsal, haberleşme ve psikososyal adlı faktörlerin kavramsal tanımıyla birlikte 25 hakeme verilmiştir.

Beşinci aşamada aracın güvenilirliği ve yapısal geçerliliği için YEETKANÖ'nün dördüncü şekli hiç bir yetişkin eğitimi etkinliğine katılmamış 325 kişiye uygulanmıştır. Araç iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Birinci bölümde bazı demografik özelliklerle ilgili sorular vardır. İkinci bölüm katılmama

nedenlerini belirten 4 ölçekli Likert tipi 74 maddeden oluşmuştur.

Aracın güvenilirliği için Cronbach alpha ve madde toplam istatistikleri hesaplanmıştır. Cronbach alpha .9323 olarak bulunmuştur.

Aracın yapısal geçerliliği için yapılan faktör analizinde 15 faktör elde edilmiştir. Bu faktörler hakemlerin sınıflandırması ile tutarlıdır. Daha sonra faktör sayısı 8'e indirilmiş ve bu faktörler, maddi sınırlamalar, eğitim etkinliklerine karşı olumsuz tutum, zaman sınırlamaları, çevreden çekinme ve korku, düşük öz güven, iletişimsel engeller, aile sorumluluğu ve kurumsal engeller olarak isimlendirilmiştir.

Alttest güvenilirlik analizleri de yapılmış ve sonuçları memnun edici bulunmuştur. Biri dışında bütün alttestlerin güvenilirlik katsayıları yüksek ve çok yüksek çıkmıştır.

Demografik özellikler ve faktörler arasında değişik düzeylerde ilişkiler bulunmuştur. Yapılan analizlerin sonuçları YEETKANÖ'nün güvenilir ve geçerli olduğu yolundadır. Ölçek, katılmama nedenlerini ve bu nedenlerin önem derecesini saptamak amacıyla yapılan çalışmalarda kullanılabilir. Alınan sonuçlar Türkiye'de ve dış ülkelerde yapılan araştırmalarda elde edilen diğer bulgularla benzerlikler göstermiştir ve aynı zamanda bizim kültürümüze özgü bazı özellikler de ortaya koymuştur.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF TABLES

# INTRODUCTION

While participation studies are important and widely carried out in adult education in order to understand why adults want to continue their education, nonparticipation studies also gain special importance in order to identify who does not participate and why, or with what kind of barriers and deterrents adults encounter in participating in adult education activities.

In this first part, the importance of the nonparticipation issue for Türkiye and at the international level will be explained. Then, the purpose of the study, the research questions and the significance of the study will be presented.

## Nonparticipation in Türkiye

The issue of nonparticipation has a special meaning for Türkiye. Although the educational level of the adult population is low in Türkiye, the number of the adults participating in adult education activities is not as high as one would expect. According to the 1990 census 19.5 % of the population above the age of 6 are illiterate. In addition to that, only 4.75 % of the population above the age of 18 have higher education; 11.72 % of the population above the age of 16 are graduates of high school and vocational school of the same level; 11.38 % of the population above the age of 13 are junior high school graduates; and although primary school

attendance is compulsory only 82.02 % of the population above the age of 14 are primary school graduates (DIE, 1993).

When the number of the participants in adult education activities is considered the following picture can be seen. In 1985-1986 school year the number of the participants who have enrolled in adult education activities offered by private or state institutions all over Türkiye was 1,448,833 (Table 1.01). This number increased to 2,613,297 in 1990-1991 school year. This means that from 1986 to 1991, the number of the participants increased 12.52 % per year as an average. This increase rate seems fairly high when compared with the population increase rate which is around 2.5 %. But when the number of the adult population is being considered, that is the number of the people between the ages of 14 and 64, which is 34,265,838 and the number of the people above the age of 65, which is 2,417,363 according to the 1990 census (DIE, 1993), a very big proportion of the population (92.88 %) seems to be not participating in adult education activities.

Table 1.01. The number of the participants in adult education activities between 1985-86 and 1990-91

| Years | Participants in State Institutions | Participants in Private Institutions | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1985-86 | 1 106 049 | 342 784 | 1 448 833 |
| 1986-87 | 1 219 425 | 328 120 | 1 547 545 |
| 1987-88 | 1 197 422 | 326 394 | 1 523 816 |
| 1988-89 | 1 322 491 | 669 220 | 1 991 711 |
| 1989-90 | 1 411 021 | 1 247 783 | 2 658 804 |
| 1990-91 | 1 597 398 | 1 015 899 | 2 613 297 |

The big proportion of the adults not participating in adult education activities indicates the need for research. In several studies the necessity of studies on the issue of the non-participation was mentioned for the purpose of identifying the reasons for nonparticipation, barriers and/or deterrents to participation. One of these studies was carried by Tekin (1988), who at the end of her study done in Ankara, suggested as further research topic that the reasons of the potential target population for not participating in formal adult education activities must be identified through comprehensive studies.

Bülbül (1991), more specifically, emphasized the illiteracy issue and suggested that the reasons of the women for not participating in literacy courses have to be studied. He pointed out that although the number of the female illiterates is higher than the male illiterates, the number of the female participants in the literacy courses is smaller than that of the males.

Ayhan (1988) also suggested that research must be carried out on the adults, who do not participate in any adult education activity, but are potential participants. She also suggested that regional screening studies using home-based interviews must be conducted. Moreover, according to her, in population censuses questions related with nonparticipation must be asked.

Oğuzkan and Okçabol (1987), in their Silivri study, also showed that 80 % of the sample (n=908) have never participated in any adult education activity. They have also

studied the barriers adults encounter in participating in adult education activities, and suggested identification of the reasons for nonparticipation or barriers to participation is necessary in order to lessen them.

Studies dealing with the reasons for nonparticipation would help the adult educators not only in lessening the barriers to participation, but also in getting information about the nonparticipants, in planning programs accordingly, in making decisions concerning the target population, in determining educational policies regarding adults, and in revising the method and the content of the programs.

Nonparticipation studies may help national and local governments to develop new types of programs in order to satisfy unmet needs as well, because unmet needs may be reflected in the reasons for not participating in adult education activities. Since Türkiye has a centralized educational system where decisions are taken by only one authority, one can assume that the local needs may not be met sufficiently. Thus there is an increasing possibility that the adult education activities be broken away from the interests and needs of the people (Okçabol, 1990). This may result in lowered participation rates. At this point, nonparticipation studies gain special importance as to give information to the central administrators about the reasons for nonparticipation of the local population, hoping that this information will be taken into consideration.

The studies done in the area of adult education were not related directly with the issue of nonparticipation and no

systematic instrument is available for identifying the reasons for nonparticipation. Therefore, development of a reliable and valid instrument to identify reasons for nonparticipation in adult education activities becomes necessary.

## Nonparticipation at the International Level

The question of who participates and who does not is a recurring preoccupation of adult educators. In principle, the aim of adult education may be to reach to every adult; in practice there is a long way in order to reach that goal. Even the most advanced countries, which have about 100 % attendance for initial education of children, cannot approach the same rate of attendance for adult continuing education. Even though there is no perfect statistics available it seems that only a minority participate in every country in any given year. This may not be that important; not all all adults has to participate in educational activities continuously throughout their lives. What is unsatisfactory is that in all societies a substantial proportion of adults never take part in any purposive educational experience at all. More particularly, adults, which adult educators claim as their priority targets constitute the largest proportion of nonparticipants (Titmus, 1989).

The issue of not participating in adult education had also been emphasized by Rene Maheu (1972, cited in Lowe, 1975, p.186), who pointed out at the Tokyo Conference that it

is the non-participant about whom the adult educators need more information:

> "It might also be well to analyze the deeper causes of one aspect-one which I consider crucial and which has not so far been studied much-of what has come to be called the crisis in education, namely the fact that in most countries adults do not sufficiently feel the need for education. This phenomenon calls urgently for intensified sociological, psychological and educational research, the results of which would provide a solid foundation for the regeneration of the content, forms and methodology of adult education. Governments, above all, would stand to gain by possessing scientific data on this question when determining the measures to be taken to give adult education optimum efficiency in relation to the community's economic and social development goals, while at the same time satisfying individual aspirations."

From the words of Maheu it can be concluded that, through studies on the non-participants, new policies can be established and effective programs and educational activities can be developed. Indeed, in the United States, such a study has been carried out to assist state-level educational policy makers. In this study, along with information about the needs of rural adults, barriers to their participation in educational programs were studied in seven Northwestern States. Specific recommendations for each state studied, as well as recommendations in the areas of state policy, institutional procedures, community responsibilities, and rural education practitioner responsibilities were made (McDaniel & others, 1986). Lowe (1975) also emphasized the role of the national governments and local government authorities that they are responsible for ensuring that as many learning needs as possible are satisfied as equitably as possible. If they find that current programs attract only a

limited number of the population and satisfy only a restricted number of needs, they should increase the amount of those programs and develop new types of programs to satisfy unmet needs.

## Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to develop a valid and reliable instrument, called Reasons for Nonparticipation Scale (RENOPAS), for identifying the adults' reasons and the magnitude of each reason for not participating in adult education activities.

## Research Questions

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

1. Is the instrument RENOPAS a reliable instrument?
2. What are the major factors underlying nonparticipation?
3. Is the instrument RENOPAS a valid instrument?
4. Are there any effect of the selected demographic variables (sex, age, educational background, marital status, number of children, occupational status of the nonparticipant and his/her spouse, the type of institution the nonparticipant and his/her spouse were working in, the residential area, the years of residence of the nonparticipant in Istanbul, house ownership, ownership of

another house, perceived family financial status, and finally perceived SES) on the factors?

## Significance of the Study

The instrument developed in this study may help adult educators to identify the adults' reasons for not participating in organized adult education activities. Since no statistically reliable and valid instrument was used until now for the identification of the reasons for nonparticipation and open-ended questions of only one type were asked in the studies conducted in Türkiye, this instrument may have contribution to the description of the adult population who do not participate in adult education activities. As an example, People's Education Centers may administer this instrument in the regions they serve and collect information about the adult population around; and may take decisions accordingly to serve to adult population effectively.

Since a theory of participation reasons includes three dimensions, i.e. reasons for participation, reasons for nonparticipation, and reasons for dropout, the development and usage of a valid and reliable instrument on reasons for nonparticipation will also contribute to the development of a theory of participation.

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, first a brief overview of nonparticipation studies will be given, then several instruments developed for identifying reasons for nonparticipation will be explained, and finally, studies conducted on the reasons for nonparticipation in Türkiye will be presented.

## Nonparticipation Studies

As early as 1965 Johnstone and Rivera noted that barriers to participation could be conceived as being situational, which are external to the individual's control, and dispositional, which are based on personal attitude. Cross (1981, cited in Beder, 1990) added institutional barriers to Johnstone and Rivera's barriers. More recent factor analytic work by Scanlan (1982, cited in Beder, 1990), Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984, cited in Beder, 1990), and Darkenwald and Valentine (1985, cited in Beder) on deterrents to participation suggest that deterrents, which are conceptually similar to barriers, differ according to the population studied. Lack of awareness about adult education offerings has sometimes been conceived as a separate ingredient in nonparticipation, (Johnstone and Rivera, 1965; cited in Beder, 1990), or as a component of deterrents (Beder, 1990).

When the whole literature is considered it can be seen that the most frequently cited barriers to participation in educational activities are lack of time and cost. Busy schedules, home and job responsibilities, and similar time-related obstacles were cited as important barriers to participation by 30 or 40 % of potential learners both by Johnstone and Rivera and by the Educational Testing Service surveys. Financial barriers were more formidable stated by 43 % of potential learners in 1962 and 53 % in 1972 where cost was found as a major impediment (cited in Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982).

There are also studies where reasons other than the ones mentioned above were found. In a study done by Munn and Mac Donald (1988), along with lack of time, family responsibilities, and lack of job relevance, another reason, that is lack of interest, was found as a reason for not participating in adult education activities. According to Munn and Mac Donald lack of interest in participation may stem from negative school experiences. But it is also possible that the educational programs offered by the institutions are not attractive.

Four general categories can be counted as barriers to participation according to Darkenwald and Merriam (1982); situational, institutional, informational, and psychosocial. Situational barriers relate to an individual's life context at a particular time, that is, the realities of one's social and physical environment. Cost, lack of time, lack of

transportation, lack of child care, and geographical isolation are examples for situational barriers.

The barriers caused by learning institutions or agencies that exclude or discourage certain groups of learners because of things like inconvenient schedules, full-time fees for part-time study, restrictive locations, and the like, are institutional barriers. Other significant institutional barriers are lack of attractive or appropriate courses and institutional policies and practices that impose inconvenience, confusion, or frustration on adult learners (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982).

The category of informational barrier is sometimes interpreted as an institutional failure in communicating information on learning opportunities to adults, but the problem is more fundamental than this. It also involves the failure of many adults, particularly the least educated and poorest to use the information that is available. In 1962, Johnstone and Rivera found that one-third of all adults had no knowledge about the educational resources for adults in their communities. Lack of information is likely to remain as a major barrier to participation in adult education, especially for disadvantaged adults (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982). Psychosocial barriers are sometimes referred to more narrowly as attitudinal or dispositional barriers. They are individually held beliefs, values, attitudes, or perceptions that inhibit participation in organized learning activities. Adults who cite barriers of "lack of interest" or state that they "are too old to learn," "don't enjoy studying," "are

tired of school" are expressing some of the wide variety of beliefs and attitudes that strongly influence participation behavior. While many of these factors might be considered psychological in nature, the term psychosocial is employed to emphasize the role of social forces generally, and of membership and reference groups specifically, in forming and maintaining attitudes toward participation in education (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982).

Negative evaluation of oneself as a potential learner is probably less closely tied to socioeconomic status, but it is nonetheless prevalent among disadvantaged and working-class adults. Lack of confidence in one's ability to learn is a commonly voiced reason for nonparticipation, but for most adults it does not reflect a realistic assessment of aptitude, self-discipline, or any other factor likely to affect performance. Closely related to negative perceptions of ability are feelings that any effort to learn will result in failure and humiliation. Despite the values and norms in lower- and working-class society that militate against participation in adult education, a great many disadvantaged and working-class adults do value adult education and participate. There is no question that psychosocial barriers to participation are formidable, but this doesn't mean that they are insurmountable. Negative attitudes and perceptions can be changed by better information, through counseling, and especially by adult educators who make an effort to work with and through the groups and institutions in the community and

work place that exert such powerful influences on individual behavior (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982).

In another study done by Pevoto (1990), the above findings are supported. Two major categories are suggested as describing the basis for nonparticipation: a negative self-image and lack of interest in courses offered.

In addition to the above listed barriers to participation in another study done by McDaniel and others (1986) a different factor was found as a barrier to participation in rural adult education. Responses given were grouped separately for learners and providers under five types of barriers to participation. The fifth category was different than the ones mentioned until now: (1) institutional, (2) informational, (3) psychological, (4) personal/situational, and (5) state policy. This factor of state policy can reflect the working system of the educational institution and thus may be a part of the institutional barriers.

In all the studies mentioned until now several methods were used to identify reasons for nonparticipation. Administration of a valid and reliable instrument, which seems more systematic although it may have important limitations when compared with qualitative methods, is most frequently used method. In addition to this, one might find it more meaningful to administer a valid and reliable instrument along with a qualitative method.

# Related Instruments

In this part, the instruments developed for identifying reasons for not participating in adult education activities are introduced, and the findings obtained through the application of these instruments are explained.

There are several instruments developed for the purpose of identifying reasons of the adults for not participating in adult education activities. One of these was developed by Scanlan and Darkenwald in 1984 (cited in Martindale & Drake; Blais, Duquette & Painchaud, 1989), called Deterrents to Participation Scale (DPS). They used the instrument to survey health professionals in New Jersey. Sample size of this study was 479, 24 % of which were considered as nonparticipants. There were 40 items with six deterrent factors labeled as (1) Disengagement (inertia, apathy, negative attitudes); (2) Lack of Quality of Course Offerings (dissatisfaction with quality of available education opportunities); (3) Cost; (4) Family Constraints; (5) Lack of Benefit (doubts about the worth and need for participation); and (6) Work Constraints."

Deterrents to Participation Scale (DPS) was also translated in French, revised, and used in a study on deterrents to women's participation in work-related educational activities (cited in Blais, Duquette & Painchaud, 1989). A panel of eight nursing continuing education specialists was instructed to judge whether each translated item was pertinent within the context of nursing continuing education in Quebec and was expressed in appropriate language

for the intended population. They were also requested to suggest additional reasons that might prevent some nurses from participating in continuing professional education taken for credit. After completion of this process, the scale comprised 50 items, 38 of which were from the DPS. Finally, the revised instrument was pilot tested with 16 nurses who were nonparticipants. The overall reliability of the final version of 0.89 (Cronbach's Alpha) was derived from analysis of the research sample subjects' responses (N=909). Respondents were instructed to indicate to what extent each of the 50 items of the instrument had been influential in their decision not to participate in continuing professional education for credit. The instrument had a 4 point scale: not at all (1), slightly (2), moderately (3), considerably (4).

This study differs from the ones of Scanlan and Darkenwald (1984) and Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) in four respects. First, all subjects were diploma nurses who were nonparticipants in continuing professional education. Secondly, the emphasis was placed on deterrents to a special type of continuing professional education which was courses offered at the university as part of a certificate or a baccalaurate degree. Thirdly, subjects were women working in a traditionally female profession. And, fourthly, cluster analysis procedures were used to explore components of deterrence to participation by nonparticipants.

Five clusters were found in this study: (1) Incidental Costs; (2) Low Priority for Work-Related Activities; (3) Absence of External Incentives; (4) Irrelevance of Additional

Formal Education for Professional Practice; and (5) Lack of Information and Affective Support. These clusters are explained below.

The first cluster "Incidental Costs" is explained by the lack of fit between the schedule and location of the courses and the costs involved in making arrangements to attend, and included eight items with the means ranging from 1.73 to 2.53 out of four. The item with the highest mean score is "Because it is difficult to get time off from work to attend these courses."

The second cluster "Low Priority for Work-Related Activities" is explained by the feeling of being overwhelmed with what may appear as conflicting role demands which leave no time for involvement in continuing education activities, and included eight items. It is comprised of items with the highest means of the scale. The means are ranging from 2.42 to 2.91. The item with the highest mean score is "Because with all my other commitments, I just don't have the time".

The third cluster "Absence of External Incentives" consists of variables describing a lack of tangible rewards and benefits for attending continuing education activities including five items with the means ranging from 2.10 to 2.67. The item with the highest mean score is "Because I am satisfied with the way I practice nursing."

The fourth cluster "Irrelevance of Additional Formal Education for Professional Practice" were comprised of variables reflecting a lack of interest in formal education as a means of improvement of practice and, more generally,

low involvement in professional activities, and included nine items with the means ranging from 1.82 to 2.26. The item with the highest item mean is "Because I tend not to be that active in professional activities."

The fifth cluster "Lack of Information and Affective Support" represent two different dimensions, one related with the individual him/herself and the other with the courses. The former dimension comprises dispositional variables, such as lack of assertiveness, lack of confidence, that is feelings of inadequacy and guilt, low expectations, lack of independence in relation to one's learning ability, and perception of the need for encouragement by family and peers. With regard to the items concerned directly with course and course quality, responses could not be based on first-hand experience with the available course offerings since respondents were nonparticipants. Therefore, according to the researchers the perceptions reflected through the responses to these items had to be based on hearsay. There are eighteen items in this cluster with the means ranging from 1.10 to 1.76. The item with the highest mean score is "Because the courses tend to be of poor quality."

Another instrument was developed by Darkenwald and Valentine in 1985 (cited in Martindale & Drake; Blais, Duquette & Painchaud, 1989) called DPS-G, which was designed for general use, another form of the DPS by Scanlan and Darkenwald. DPS-G had 34 items, and was a seven-point Likert scale. Its item reliability coefficient (coefficient alpha) was .86. DPS-G was also used by Martindale and Drake (1989)

to validate the instrument with a different population and investigate the reasons given by Air Force enlisted personnel at two bases, for not participating in voluntary, off-duty education, and its coefficient alpha was found also to be .86. Martindale and Drake used a five-point scale. In this study similar responses were given to those found in the Darkenwald and Valentine study, and the factors were consistent with both previous studies, Darkenwald and Valentine, and Scanlan and Darkenwald.

Darkenwald and Valentine used DPS-G to identify factors that deter the general public from participating in organized adult education. Their sample included the total population of households in Somerset County, New Jersey. The questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of 2000 homes. But only 215 questionnaires were returned representing 10.7 % response rate. They also found six orthogonal factors labeled as (1) Lack of Confidence; (2) Lack of Course Relevance; (3) Time Constraints; (4) Low Personal Priority; (5) Cost; and (6) Personal Problems.

Martindale and Drake (1989) assert that the factor structures in both Scanlan and Darkenwald, and Darkenwald and Valentine studies were very similar and suggest a general structure that is both complementary and more complex than Cross's earlier situational, institutional, and dispositional typology. The results of the application of DPS and DPS-G were indeed very similar to each other. The only differences were logical results of population differences in income, education, and age. According to Martindale and Drake this

suggests a strong argument for the general validity of the instrument.

Martindale and Drake (1989) applied DPS-G to a sample of 2734 enlisted personnel at Maxwell and Gunter Air Force Bases in Alabama. A stratified random sample was selected for the study by computer. One third of the available men and all of the women stratified by rank and base were randomly selected. Their sample size reached to 966 which of 357 were participants and 609 nonparticipants in volunteer education programs. They found eight factors derived from a review of literature, study of the Scanlan (1982) and Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) analyses, and the researcher's information about the population. These eight factors in the order of the amount of explained variance, were (1) lack of course relevance; (2) lack of confidence; (3) cost; (4) time constraints; (5) lack of convenience; (6) lack of interest; (7) family problems; and (8) lack of encouragement. Four of these eight factors (factors 1, 2, 3, 4) aligned with the six factors in the Darkenwald and Valentine study (1985) so well that the same names were used again in this study for ease of comparison. The names of the other two factors were changed because the meanings within this factor model and the variables were different. These two were added as new factors, since they fit the literature and extend the factors as deterrent constructs.

The first factor was called "Lack of Course Relevance" including eight items. The highest loading item of this factor was "Because I didn't think the course would meet my

needs" with a loading value of .78, and the lowest loading item was "Because I prefer to learn on my own" with a loading value of .48.

The second factor found was called "Lack of Confidence" which is a dispositional factor, consisted of seven variables. The highest loading item of this factor was "Because I was not confident of my learning ability" (.75), and the lowest loading item was "Because I didn't meet the requirements for the course" (.40).

The third factor was called "Cost." There were three variables in this factor. The highest loading one was "Because I couldn't afford miscellaneous expenses" with a value of .84. The lowest loading one was "Because my employer would not provide enough financial assistance or reimbursement" with a loading value of .64.

The fourth factor was called "Time Constraints" consisted of four variables. The highest loading one was "Because I didn't think I could attend regularly" with a value of .73. The lowest loading one was "Because I didn't think I would be able to finish" with a loading value of .55.

The fifth factor was called "Lack of Convenience". There were four variables in this factor. The highest loading item was "Because the course was at an inconvenient location" with a loading value of .74. The lowest loading item was "Because the course was offered in an unsafe area" with a loading value of .44. This factor combines time inconveniency with other inconveniencies.

The sixth factor was called "Lack of Interest" consisted of three variables. The highest loading item was "Because I wasn't willing to give up my leisure time" with a loading value of .78. The lowest loading item was "Because I don't enjoy studying" with a loading value of .59.

The seventh factor was called "Family Problems." There were three variables in this factor. The highest loading one was "Because I had trouble arranging for child care" with a loading value of .79. The lowest loading one was "Because participation would take away my family time."

The eighth factor was called "Lack of Encouragement" consisted of three variables. The highest loading one was "Because my friends did not encourage my participation" with a loading value of .69. The lowest loading one was "Because I did not know about available courses" with a loading value of .43.

In summary, the variables in the DPS-G formed eight factors with no extraneous variables within them. The factors seemed clearly differentiated and were consistent with the structure established in the literature. One item did not load with any factor, and three items loaded on more than one factor. The expected deterrent factors were cost, time, and family. Lack of Interest and Lack of Course Relevance factors were more clearly separated than in previous studies, and Lack of Convenience and Lack of Encouragement factors added new dimensions to the construct of deterrents to participation in adult education (Martindale & Drake, 1989).

A difference between the studies of Scanlan (1982) and Martindale and Drake (1989) was that Scanlan had used a seven point Likert scale, and Martindale and Drake a five point Likert scale from the DPS-G.

Martindale and Drake (1989) further asserted that a better understanding of the dispositional barriers important to the deterrent side of the participation model is needed. According to them, these are subtle demotivators closely tied to self-concept and therefore hard to measure, and they could have a greater role in deterrents to participation than what has yet been revealed sofar. Thus, they suggest an instrument that adds self-concept measures in surveys on the reasons for non-participation.

Another instrument called "Reasons for Nonparticipation" was developed by Hal Beder (1990). He has used that instrument in a study where he aimed to determine reasons for nonparticipation in adult basic education (ABE), and to see whether there was an underlying structure to those reasons, and whether sociodemographic variables were associated with reasons for nonparticipation. This instrument consisted of 32 items in Likert format which operationalized the concept "reasons for nonparticipation." The internal consistency of the scale was .85 (Cronbach's alpha). In order to enhance the correspondence between the items and the reality of the subjects themselves, items were derived from open-ended interviews with 21 high school drop-outs who had never participated in ABE. Respondents were asked a series of questions designed to determine why they had not completed

high school. All interviews were tape-recorded, and whenever possible, items were phrased using the actual words of the interviewees. Although that instrument has been developed for the purpose of identifying reasons for nonparticipation in adult basic education activities, the items do have general character, and may be used for studying the reasons for nonparticipation in any adult education activity.

Hal Beder (1990) conducted the study among 129 Iowa adults who were eighteen years or older, had not completed high school, and had never attended ABE. The items of this instrument were subjected to factor analysis (SAS, Principal components with Varimax rotation). The initial factor analysis resulted in ten factors with eigenvalues greater than one. However, after examining factor solutions for between two and ten factors, and based on the results of a scree test, a five factor solution was ultimately chosen. Measures of sampling adequacy (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure equals to .72) indicated that the sample was sufficiently large for factor stability (Norusis, 1985; cited in Beder, 1990). Factor scores were then derived for each of the five factors, and correlations (Pearson's) between the factor scores and demographic variables were computed.

The six reasons for nonparticipation which have the greatest mean scores, 2.0 or greater on a three point Likert scale, were (1) I would feel strange going back to school; (2) There aren't many people in adult high school classes my age; (3) Going back would be like going to high school all over again; (4) I am too old to go back to school; (5) I

don't know anything about adult high school classes; and (6) A high school diploma wouldn't improve my life.

The first, second, third, fourth, and sixth reasons pertain to negative perceptions of, or attitudes towards, ABE. As such, they fall into the category of dispositional barriers as defined by Johnstone and Rivera (1965, cited in Beder, 1990). The fifth item can best be interpreted as an informational barrier. The items were subjected to factor analysis to determine whether an underlying structure was apparent, and as a result five factors emerged.

The first factor, Low Perception of Need, contains items relating to perceptions of need, and respondents' perception of their age-set status. There were ten items in this factor with mean scores ranging from 1.3 to 2.0 out of 3 points. The three items with the mean score of 2.0. were: "A high school diploma wouldn't improve my life," "I am too old to go back to school," and "There aren't many people in adult high school classes who are my age."

The second factor, labeled "Perceived Effort," was constituted by variables which refer to the perceived effort it takes to complete school. Conceptually these perceptions were of two types. On one hand, they include items which refer to the effort which must be expended to participate in classes, on the other hand, however, this factor also includes items which extend beyond classes, such as the effort required to overcome financial constraints and the effort to overcome general problems of life. There were nine items with mean scores ranging from 1.3 to 2.0. Two of the

items which had a mean score of 2.0. They were "Going back to adult classes would be like going to high school all over again," and "I don't know anything about adult high school classes."

The third factor, dislike for school, contained three items. These were "I just don't like school" with a mean score of 1.4, "I am too lazy to go back to school" with a mean score of 1.3, and "I didn't like school, so I don't want to go back" with the mean score of 1.5.

In accordance with the literature on participation and deterrents to participation, the fourth factor has been termed Situational Barriers which was defined as "barriers [which] relate to an individual's life context at a particular time, that is, the realities of one's social and physical environment" (Darkenwald and Merriam,1982; p.137). It included three items. These were "I don't have enough free time to go back to school," "I have to take care of my family," and "I have too many conflicts at work to go back to school."

The last factor was too difficult to interpret. It included three items; "I move around too much," "I already know enough," and "I don't have enough energy to go back to school." This factor was deleted from analysis as being uninterpretable.

Taken together, the five factors explain 46 % of the variance, with Factors I through Factor V explaining 20 %, 7 %, 7 %, 6 %, and 5 %, respectively. The mean item scores of the factors as the best measures of factor magnitude

suggest that Low Perception of Need (1.7), Perceived Effort (1.6), and Situational Barriers (1.7) were about equal in magnitude and that Dislike for School (1.4) was of secondary importance.

To determine whether reasons for nonparticipation were associated with demographic traits factor scores were computed and correlated with demographic variables. Low Perception of Need correlated at the .05 level or better with separation or divorce, widowhood, number of children in the home, full time employment, retirement, last grade attended, health status, and age. As nonparticipants' age increased, the low perceptions of need increased. Perceived Effort indicated no correlation with any demographic variable, and Dislike for School correlated only with health status.

Situational Barriers showed significant correlations with marriage, widowhood, number of children in the home, and employed full time. Taken together, being married, having children in the home, and full time employment suggest a mid-life, family-oriented life status. It was inferred that situational barriers derive from the role responsibilities associated with this stage in life.

It was discussed by the researcher that the reasons why adults do not participate in adult basic education are multidimensional. They choose not to participate because of low perceptions of need, the perception that participation would entail too much effort, dislike for school, and situational barriers. These findings were roughly consistent with Hayes' (1988) research. But for the fact that this

research was based on factor analysis, a procedure which is generally considered to be population specific, and that all subjects resided in the state of Iowa, a state which is relatively homogeneous in respect to race and rural/small town composition, care must be taken in generalizing the results to other contexts.

In another study, Hayes and Darkenwald (1988) developed an instrument called "Deterrents to Participation Scale -Form LL (low literates)" (DPS-LL) for the purpose of developing a comprehensive way to view systematic differences in groups of low-literate adults through the creation of a typology based on deterrents to participation in adult basic education. That typology was aimed to provide a basis for the development of strategies and programs to meet the needs of specific subgroups of the low-literate population in adult basic education. The instrument consisted of 32 items on a Likert-type scale, each representing a discrete deterrent to participation. Respondents were asked to indicate how important each item was as a deterrent to their participation prior to their enrollment in ABE classes. To ensure that the respondents understood the written items, all directions and items were read aloud by an instrument administrator. The alpha reliability of the DPS-LL was .82. Its content validity was established by the use of interviews with low-literate ABE students and ABE teachers to generate individual items on the scale. Principal components analysis was used to analyze the DPS-LL data. While 11 factors met the initial criterion for retention (an eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater), a five

factor orthogonal solution was selected as the most conceptually meaningful representation of the data. The sample of the study consisted of 160 ABE students in seven urban ABE programs. These adult students were asked to identify the barriers that prevented their participation in the past. The factors are described below.

The first factor was "Low Self-Confidence." The items in this factor reflected feelings of low self-esteem in general, and specifically in regard to academic ability. Some items suggested a fear of specific tasks required in the educational process. There were six items in this factor with mean scores ranging from 1.42 to 1.80. The item with the highest mean score was "I thought it would take too long for me to finish school."

The second factor was "Social Disapproval." This factor was comprised of items that suggest the existence of a social environment in which education is not perceived as helpful or important. This factor consisted of six items, with the means ranging from 1.12 to 1.57. The item with the highest mean score was "I didn't know anyone who was going to the adult education classes."

The third factor is "Situational Barriers". This factor, similar to the category of situational barriers described by Cross (1981), consisted of items such as costs, lack of transportation, and family problems. There are four items in this factor, and their mean scores are ranging from 1.34 to 1.78. The item with the highest mean score was "I had family problems."

The fourth factor was "Negative Attitude to Classes." The items in this factor indicated a dislike of schoolwork or classes, or of an aspect of participation in classes, such as going to a school building. Unlike Cross's Institutional Barriers, these items generally represented a personal evaluation rather than a barrier caused by the institution. This factor comprised five items, and their mean scores ranged from 1.08 to 1.29. The item with the highest mean score was "I don't like doing schoolwork."

The fifth factor was "Low Personal Priority." This factor was defined by the situations in which other activities take precedence over education. There were five items in this factor with mean scores ranging from 1.23 to 1.76. The item with the highest mean score was "It was more important to get a job than to go to school."

The factors found in the study of Hayes and Darkenwald (1988) were further studied and cluster analysis was conducted in order to develop a typology (Hayes, 1988). Cluster analysis was defined by Lorr (1983, p.11; cited in Hayes, 1988) as the grouping of entities (in this study, individuals) into subsets on the basis of their similarity across a set of attributes. Individuals were clustered according to their factor scores on the five deterrent factors.

A series of cluster analyses was performed that yielded solutions with two to eight clusters. A final solution was selected with maximum number of clusters with meaningful patterns of cluster means on the five deterrent factors.

Seven solutions were examined, and the six cluster solution was selected as the most useful for the development of a typology. It yielded the largest number of meaningful groups clearly distinguishable from each other based on mean deterrent factor scores and sociodemographic characteristics. The descriptions of the six types of low-literate adults based on their deterrents to participation are listed below.

Type one group consisting of only 3.3 % of the total sample, had a relatively high mean score on Social Disapproval and low mean scores on all other deterrent factors. The group's most striking characteristic was the high rate of employment (83 %). According to Hayes the results suggest that this group consisted of employed individuals who had relatively positive attitudes towards themselves as learners and towards education, but who feared a negative response to their participation from family, friends, and co-workers.

Type two group comprised the second largest group, including 18.9 % of the sample. Their highest mean deterrent score was on the Situational Barriers factor, followed by Low-Self-Confidence. Most of them (87 %) were women. According to Hayes the group consisted of many young women who were deterred from participation by child care responsibilities and perhaps by financial difficulties corresponding to lack of employment, combined with barriers related to low self-confidence.

Type three group, consisting 12.6 % of the sample, was distinguished by a high proportion of males (50 %), the

highest mean age (38.2 years), and the lowest level of prior educational attainment (7.6 years) of any type. According to Hayes their highest mean score on Low Self-Confidence as a deterrent factor suggests that these individuals were primarily deterred by a fear of failure linked perhaps to early educational difficulties and possibly the perception of being too old to learn. These somewhat older adults also scored relatively highly on Personal Priority as a deterrent factor, perhaps reflecting a diminished perception of a demand for education as a means of career development.

Type four group, the smallest group (2.5 % of the total sample) had its highest mean deterrent score on Attitude to Classes, and its second highest score on Social Disapproval. The group's lowest score was on Situational Barriers. The group was remarkable for its low mean age (18.2 years), and its high proportion of males (75 %). For these young drop-outs, negative educational experiences and peer group pressures, rather than work or family commitments experienced by older adults, appear to present important barriers to participation.

Type five group, 16.3 % of the total sample, had its highest score on Personal Priority and its lowest score on Low Self-Confidence as deterrent factors. This type was characterized by its high proportion of females (85 %), a correspondingly high proportion with dependent children (73 %), and a low rate of employment (38 %). According to the researcher, like Type Two, this group seemed to consist of mothers whose family responsibilities and needs to find

employment took precedence over education. However, in contrast to the second type, they perceived lack of time rather than lack of money or confidence as a major deterrent.

Type six group can be described as "low-deterred." These individuals as a group had relatively low scores on all deterrent factors. The sociodemographic characteristics of this group were similar to the sample as a whole, except that a smaller proportion (37 %) had dependent children, and the mean age of the youngest dependent child (9.2 years) was the highest of any group. The disproportionately large size of the group (45.9 % of the sample), according to Hayes, seems to indicate that it represented individuals most likely to participate in ABE who were younger women (the mean age of the group was 28.1 years) with a reasonably high level of educational attainment (the mean of the group was 9.3 years) who were generally free from dispositional kinds of barriers, as well as from family responsibilities leading to situational barriers. But another question emerges here "What deterred this group to participate in adult education activities?"

The results of this study demonstrated that meaningful subgroups of the low-literate population could be identified as based on their perception of deterrents to participation in ABE. Due to the nature of the sample, however, it cannot be assumed that the typology represents all possible types of low-literate adults deterred from participation. In addition, the validity of the identified types and the factors on which they were based must be established through replication of

the study with additional groups of low-literate adults (Hayes, 1988).

## Related Studies in Türkiye

Several barriers to participation as reasons for nonparticipation are listed until now. All of them were the findings of the studies conducted in countries other than Türkiye. Similar studies which have been carried out in Türkiye found some other factors as reasons for nonparticipation. One of these studies was done by Tuğrul (1982, cited in Ural, 1993), indicated that adult education activities do not attract adult learners because of the traditional and non-functional types of the educational activities. It was also suggested that adult educators must carry out evaluation studies for understanding and satisfying the unmet needs of adult learners. Tuğrul's suggestion indicates the value of nonparticipation studies as to inform the adult educators in doing sound needs assessment studies.

In another study, Okçabol (1992-93) asked a group of participants who did not participate in any course before, why they did not. Most of those adults (31 %) stated that they "did not need education." Other reasons stated for nonparticipation include; "job demands" (18 %), "lack of finance power" (15 %), and "lack of time" (11 %).

Tekin (1988) carried out research in Ankara, where she studied the factors motivating the adults for participating in formal adult education activities and difficulties adults

encountered during participation. She found that for more than half of the adult learners (64.16 %) the difficulties in transportation due to the location of schools was a very important problem. This was probably a potential reason for not participating in adult education activities. She proposed that schools located in central areas of the city need to be more attractive for a would-be-learner.

In another study carried out by Oğuzkan and Okçabol (1987) in Silivri, several reasons for nonparticipation were found such as "lack of financial resources," "lack of time," "lack of educational program as desired," "job demands," "family problems," "health problems," "transportation problems," "easy (quick) forgetting," "being illiterate," "not comprehending written material," "unwillingness," "not finding the possibility," and "being old."

Ural (1993), in her research on reasons for participating in adult education activities, asked why the adults did not participate in adult education activities in the past. The reasons she found were the ones such as "I was continuing with the school," "I was working," "I didn't have information about the courses," "There was nobody to care of my child," "I didn't have desire/need," "It was too difficult to go to the course place," "I didn't have time," and "I didn't have money."

There is another study that was conducted by Atakan (1982), to identify possible wastage related factors in literacy courses being conducted in the Şişli-Gültepe area of Istanbul. In this study, it was found that expectations

regarding the course, volition, felt needs, and teacher characteristics appeared to be dropout-related factors. These factors could be reasons for dropout for these participants, as well as for nonparticipation for the ones who are the friends or the acquaintances of the participants, and did not participate in any educational activity.

# METHODOLOGY

Main purpose of this study was to develop an instrument in order to identify the adults' reasons for not participating in adult education activities. It was realized through five steps. The first three steps were related with the generation of the items, fourth step was related to content validation of the instrument, and the fifth step was related to the internal consistency and construct validation of the instrument.

## The Generation of the Items

Items were generated in three steps. In the first step, items were generated according to the review of literature. In the second step, interviews were carried out with 20 adults who have never participated in adult education activities. In the third step interviews were conducted with 25 people who work in the field of adult education as administrators and/or practitioners.

## First Step

In this step, selected studies on reasons for nonparticipation in adult education activities done in foreign countries and in Türkiye were reviewed. Mostly, the items of the instruments developed in the studies conducted in foreign countries were used. Some of them were taken as the same, translated into Turkish, most of the items were

revised by the researcher. Additionally the researcher generated items from the findings of the studies done in Türkiye. All of these items were classified by the researcher under four factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial) identified by Darkenwald and Merriam (1982). During this classification some of the items were revised and reformulated again by the researcher. At the end of this step 114 items were generated, which constituted the first form of the "Reasons for Nonparticipation Scale (RENOPAS)."

## Second Step

In this step, interviews were conducted with 20 adults who have never participated in any organized adult education activity and are at least primary school graduates, in order the items to reflect the reality.

### Subjects

Convenience sampling method was used which is one of the nonprobability sampling methods. The sample was selected among the staff of the Boğaziçi University and from the Rumelihisarüstü residence area, in İstanbul, because of the availability. In order for the subjects to be eligible the following question was asked to them: "Except going to a school as a student, have you ever participated in any organized adult education activity such as a course or any learning activity offered by a private or state institution like People's Education Center?." If the answer was "No,"

then that person was interviewed. Interviews were carried out individually in their homes or work places. There were 10 males and 10 females who were selected for the interview. Four of them were between the ages of 18 and 24, six of them were between the ages of 27 and 31, four of them were between the ages of 34 and 40, and six of them were between the ages of 47 and 63. Their mean age was 36.5.

Content of the interview

The interview form was prepared by the researcher and contained questions related with the reasons for nonparticipation and demographic characteristics like sex, age, educational background, duration of urbanization, marital status, number of children, and occupational characteristics (Appendix A). In terms of the reasons for nonparticipation the following two questions were asked:

1. What are your reasons for not participating in any organized adult education activity out of school, which is offered by a private institution, your employer, or a state institution like People's Education Centers, up to now? Would you state the reasons one by one?
2. Among your acquaintances, if there is anyone who has never participated in any organized adult education activity, in your opinion, what may be the possible reasons of them for not participating in adult education activities until now?

Item generation

According to the data gathered from the interviews, additional items were generated. Some of the items generated during the review of literature were revised and some of the items that are similar to the others were eliminated by the researcher. During this procedure each statement of the individuals was evaluated and utilized regardless of the frequency of the statement. At the end of this step the number of the items decreased to 97. These items constituted the second form of RENOPAS.

## Third Step

As a third step, interviews were conducted with 25 experts who work in the field of adult education as administrators and/or practitioners. These people were used because they are in direct interaction with both the adults who participate in adult education activities and who reject participating in adult education activities. The researcher thought that they may have an opinion about the reasons of the adults for not participating in organized adult education activities. Thus, they were asked to state their opinions about these reasons.

Experts

The experts were selected from the available People's Education Centers and foundations. Among these experts interviewed, 17 of them were female and 8 of them were male; 8 of them were directors of People's Education Centers, 7 of

them were vice directors, 5 of them were teaching staff; 1 of them was working as a guidance counselor; 2 of them were responsible for educational programs in a foundation and one of those experts was the president of another foundation, which organizes educational programs and seminars for the teachers and guidance counselors in schools; and one of the experts was working as a clerk in a People's Education Center and had worked as a teacher in a People's Education Center in another city.

The content of the interview

The interview used in this step was a structured one which consisted of two parts (Appendix B). The first part included questions about demographic characteristics and the other part opinions about the reasons for nonparticipation. In the demographic part experts were asked their sex, the institution they are working in, their educational level, their duty in the institution they work, how long they have been working in the institution, whether they have worked before and in what kind of an institution and their duty in their former job. In the second part they were asked the reasons stated by the nonparticipants, and their own opinions related to the issue of nonparticipation.

Item generation

During this procedure opinions of each expert was assessed and utilized regardless of its frequency. Additional items were generated, some of the items generated earlier

were revised again, and some of the items were eliminated by the researcher because they were basically indicating similar reasons. At the end of this step the number of the items decreased to 96. These items constituted the third form of RENOPAS.

## Content Validation

In the fourth step, the content validity of the RENOPAS was studied. For this purpose, the third form of the instrument and a list of four factors, i.e. the situational, institutional, informational, and psychosocial ones, with their conceptual definitions (Darkenwald & Merriam, 1982) were given to a group of 25 judges to classify the items under four factors (Appendix C). Four factors that were identified by Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) after they have reviewed all the significant studies done in foreign countries and classified the reasons found in those studies. The conceptual definitions of the factors were as following:

The situational barriers are the realities of one's social and physical environment that are related to an individual's life context at a particular time. Cost and lack of time are examples. Other situational barriers of consequence include lack of transportation, lack of child care, and geographical isolation.

The institutional barriers are the ones which are caused 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, restrictive locations, and the like. Other significant institutional barriers are lack of attractive or appropriate courses and institutional policies and practices that impose inconvenience, confusion, or frustration on adult learners.

The category of informational barrier is sometimes construed simply to mean institutional failure in communicating information on learning opportunities to adults, but also individual failure in getting information from the institutions offering educational activities.

Psychosocial barriers are referred to more narrowly as attitudinal or dispositional barriers. They are individually held beliefs, values, attitudes, or perceptions that inhibit participation in organized learning activities. Adults who cite barriers as "lack of interest" or state that they "are too old to learn," "don't enjoy studying," "are tired of school," and so forth are expressing some of the wide variety of beliefs and attitudes that strongly influence participation behavior.

## The Judges

25 judges were selected from available people who have at least master's degrees on educational sciences and psychology. They were selected from the available universities and institutions. Except 4 judges, they were academic staff in adult education, educational sciences, and psychology. 4 judges were from the mother-child education foundation who have master's degrees in different areas.

Among the academic staff, 10 of them were working in the department of educational sciences, 3 of them in the department of science education, 3 of them in the department of psychology and 5 of them were working in the department of adult education; 4 of them were research assistants, 6 of them instructors, 8 of them assistant professors and 3 of them were professors.

## Item Elimination/Selection Procedure

The judges were requested to evaluate the items. First, judges were asked to classify the items under the previously determined factors according to their given conceptual definitions. In order to classify each item under one of the four factors, judges gave each item the number of any four factor listed. The items placed into each factor were identified as operational definitions of that factor. Then, the judges were asked to give each item a score from 1 to 3, indicating the degree to which the item in question is suitable for that factor.

After the data were collected all items were listed with their factor classification and factor suitability percentages. Factor classification percentage was calculated as the percentage of the judges who placed an item into one of the factors. And the factor suitability percentage was calculated as the percentage of the judges who gave the scores of 2 and 3 to an item. The researcher had 3 steps for the item elimination/selection procedure.

In the first step, the researcher evaluated the items with the factor classification percentage of at least 80 to 100. The number of the items in this group were 49. The factor suitability percentage of these items were taken into consideration, and it was seen that these percentages differed from 54.2 to 100. These factor suitability percentages were found sufficient as a criterion for belonging to any factor, because they were greater than 50%, and the researcher didn't eliminate any of these items except the ones that were believed that they indicated the similar reason to the others. 3 items were eliminated and some other items were revised grammatically.

In the next step, the items with the factor classification percentage of 70.8 to 79.2 were evaluated. The number of the items in this group was 19. The factor suitability percentages of these items were taken into consideration and it was seen that these percentages differed from 70.6 to 100. They were found sufficient and the researcher did not eliminate any of these items except the ones that were indicating the similar reason to the others. 2 items were eliminated and some of the items were revised. One item of this group was combined together with one item of the former group.

In the last step, the remaining 28 items with the factor classification percentage of 37.5 to 66.7 were evaluated. 16 of them were eliminated. If an item in question was indicating a reason stated by the non-participant adults at the second step and by the experts at the third step of the

item generation process, it was not eliminated from the instrument. Instead, most of these items were revised. The factor suitability percentages of these items were differing from 61.5 to 93.7. At the end, the fourth form of RENOPAS with 74 items was generated.

## Internal Consistency and Construct Validation

In the fifth step, for the internal consistency and construct validity of the instrument, the fourth form of RENOPAS was administered to adults who had never participated in any adult education activity offered by private or state institutions like People's Education Centers.

Cronbach's alpha and item-total correlations were calculated for the internal consistency, and a factor analysis was conducted for the construct validity. At the end of the fifth step the final form of RENOPAS was generated.

## Population and Sample

The population was the adults who had never participated in any adult education activity offered by private or state institutions like People's Education Centers. The sampling technique used was a type of nonprobability technique where convenience and quota sampling techniques were joined together; because it was impossible to list all members of the population of interest, and subjects whoever happens to be available were used. Literate adults were chosen who were at least primary school dropouts or graduates because the

instrument was a self-administered type. The ideal sample size was at least 444 for the purpose of carrying out factor analysis, since about 6-10 times the number of people as items is necessary for a safe factor analysis (Gable, 1986), but because of time and financial constraints the instrument was administered to only 325 nonparticipants. The subjects were selected from homes in different residence areas and from different work places with differentiating levels of SES. This selection was limited with the places where the interviewer could go.

## Instrument

The instrument used in this step was the fourth form of RENOPAS (Appendix D). It consisted of two parts. The questions in the first part were related with demographic characteristics like sex, age, educational background, marital status, number of children, occupational characteristics of the nonparticipant and his/her spouse, the type of institution the nonparticipant and his/her spouse were working in, the years of residence of the nonparticipant in Istanbul, house ownership, ownership of another house or, perceived family financial status, and finally perceived SES.

The second part of RENOPAS included 74 items indicating reasons for not participating in adult education activities. These are 4 point Likert type items with the values from 1 to 4. The meanings of these values differ from never true (correct) to very true (correct), respectively.

## Procedure

Some part of the data was collected by the researcher himself and the rest of the data by the interviewers who were trained and employed by the researcher, during December and January. It was announced by the researcher that interviewers are wanted for a research project. Most of the interviewers were university students and some of them were research assistants. When they had applied, the researcher explained the research in detail and how to administer the instrument. No pilot administration was done.

During data collection, every nonparticipant was visited by the researcher and the interviewers at their homes and work places and were administered the instrument individually or as a group when possible. For the eligibility of the nonparticipants each adult was asked whether s/he has ever participated in any adult education activity since the age of 14. If the adult in question met the criteria, s/he was administered the instrument. The detailed criteria for the eligibility of a subject are given in Appendix E.

## Sample's Demographic Characteristics

Included in the instrument, questions to identify demographic characteristics like sex, age, educational background, marital status, number of children, occupational status of the nonparticipant and his/her spouse, the type of institution the nonparticipant and his/her spouse were working in, the residential area, the years of residence of the nonparticipant in Istanbul, house ownership, whether the

nonparticipant owns another house or not, perceived family financial status, and finally the perceived SES, i.e. how the nonparticipants see their place in the society considering their jobs, educational level, the place they're living in, and income level, were also asked to the same sample of 325 nonparticipants.

50.5% of the subjects (n=164) in the sample was female and 49.5% (n=161) was male. The other demographic characteristics are presented in the tables.

Age level of the participants. Most of the subjects were at the age level of 40-49 (22.2%). Most of the females were at the age level of 30-39 (25%), and most of the males were at the age level of 40-49 (21.1%) (Table 3.01).

Table 3.01. The distribution of the nonparticipants according to their age groups and sexes

| Age group | Sex | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Female | | Male | | | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| 14-19 | 14 | 8.5 | 19 | 11.9 | 33 | 10.2 |
| 20-24 | 27 | 16.5 | 24 | 14.9 | 51 | 15.7 |
| 25-29 | 30 | 18.3 | 33 | 20.5 | 63 | 19.4 |
| 30-39 | 41 | 25.0 | 30 | 18.6 | 71 | 21.8 |
| 40-49 | 38 | 23.2 | 34 | 21.1 | 72 | 22.2 |
| 50- | 14 | 8.5 | 21 | 13.0 | 35 | 10.8 |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 161 | 100.0 | 325 | 100.0 |

Educational level of the nonparticipants. Most of the subjects were primary school graduates (31.7%) and high school graduates (27.1%). This distribution was also the same for each sex. Additionally, the percentage of the male graduates of higher educational institutions (19.9%) was higher than the female graduates (12.8%) (Table 3.02).

Table 3.02. Educational level of the nonparticipants

| | Sex | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fmale | | Male | | Total | |
| Educational Level | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Primary school dropouts | 12 | 7.3 | 15 | 9.3 | 27 | 8.3 |
| Primary school graduates | 51 | 31.1 | 52 | 32.3 | 103 | 31.7 |
| Middle school graduates | 31 | 18.9 | 22 | 13.7 | 53 | 16.3 |
| High school graduates | 48 | 29.3 | 40 | 24.8 | 88 | 27.1 |
| Graduates of higher educational institutions | 21 | 12.8 | 32 | 19.9 | 53 | 16.3 |
| Missing | 1 | .6 | | | 1 | .3 |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 161 | 100.0 | 324 | 100.0 |

Marital status of the nonparticipants. Most of the nonparticipants were married (67.4%). The percentage of married female subjects (70.12%) is greater than that of males (67.4%) (Table 3.03).

Table 3.03. Marital status of the nonparticipants

| Marital Status | Sex | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Female | | Male | | | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Single | 42 | 25.61 | 52 | 32.3 | 94 | 28.9 |
| Married | 115 | 70.12 | 104 | 64.6 | 219 | 67.4 |
| Divorced | 3 | 1.83 | 2 | 1.2 | 5 | 1.5 |
| Widow | 4 | 2.44 | 3 | 1.9 | 7 | 2.2 |
| Total | 164 | 100.00 | 161 | 100.0 | 325 | 100.0 |

When the age groups were taken into consideration, all of the subjects in the age group of 14-19 were single, and none of the subjects in the age group of 40-49 was single (Table 3.04).

Table 3.04. Marital Status of the nonparticipants according to the age groups

| Age Groups | Marital Status | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Single | | Married | | Divorced | | Widow | | Missing | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| 14-19 | 33 | 36.3 | | | | | | | | |
| 20-24 | 34 | 37.4 | 17 | 7.8 | | | | | | |
| 25-29 | 14 | 15.4 | 45 | 20.5 | | | | | | |
| 30-39 | 10 | 11.0 | 60 | 27.4 | | | | | | |
| 40-49 | | | 68 | 31.1 | 3 | 100.0 | 1 | 14.3 | | |
| 50- | | | 29 | 13.2 | | | 6 | 85.7 | | |
| Missing | | | | | | | | | 5 | 1.5 |
| Total | 91 | 100.0 | 219 | 100.0 | 3 | 100.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 325 | |

Number of children. Most of the married subjects (37.44%) have two children. 11.87% of the married subjects have no child (Table 3.05).

Table 3.05. Number of children of the subjects

| Number of children | Marital Status | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Married | | Divorced | | Widow | | Total | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| No child | 26 | 11.9 | 1 | 20.0 | | | 27 | 11.7 |
| One | 45 | 20.6 | 3 | 60.0 | 2 | 28.6 | 50 | 21.6 |
| Two | 82 | 37.4 | 1 | 20.0 | 2 | 28.6 | 85 | 36.8 |
| Three | 41 | 18.7 | | | | | 41 | 17.8 |
| Four & more | 21 | 9.6 | | | 3 | 42.8 | 24 | 10.4 |
| Missing | 4 | 1.8 | | | | | 4 | 1.7 |
| Total | 219 | 100.0 | 5 | 100.0 | 7 | 100.0 | 231 | 100.0 |

Occupational status. Most of the males were blue collar worker (35.40%), then come the entrepreneurs (32.92%). Most of the females were housewife (49.39%), then come the blue collar workers (Table 3.06).

Table 3.06. Occupational status of the nonparticipants

| Occupational Status | Sex | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Female | | Male | | | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Unemployed | 9 | 5.5 | 5 | 3.1 | 14 | 4.3 |
| Housewife | 81 | 49.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 81 | 24.9 |
| Retired | 6 | 3.7 | 8 | 5.0 | 14 | 4.3 |
| Blue collar worker | 33 | 20.1 | 57 | 35.4 | 90 | 27.7 |
| White collar worker | 24 | 14.6 | 29 | 18.0 | 53 | 16.3 |
| Entrepreneur | 9 | 5.5 | 53 | 32.9 | 62 | 19.1 |
| Missing | 2 | 1.2 | 9 | 5.6 | 11 | 3.4 |
| Total | 164 | 100.0 | 161 | 100.0 | 325 | 100.0 |

Spouse's occupational status. Most of the male subjects' partners were housewives (77.90%); and most of the female subjects' partners were white collar workers (30.84%) and entrepreneurs (30.84%) (Table 3.07).

Table 3.07. Spouse's occupational status according to the sexes

| Spouse's Occupational Status | Sex | | | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Female | | Male | | | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| Housewife | - | - | 74 | 78.0 | 74 | 36.6 |
| Retired | 11 | 10.3 | 5 | 5.3 | 16 | 8.0 |
| Blue collar worker | 30 | 28.1 | 5 | 5.3 | 35 | 17.3 |
| White collar worker | 33 | 30.8 | 9 | 9.5 | 42 | 20.8 |
| Entrepreneur | 33 | 30.8 | 2 | 2.1 | 35 | 17.3 |
| Total | 107 | 100.0 | 95 | 100.0 | 202 | 100.0 |

Years of residence in İstanbul. This demographic characteristic was evaluated on the basis of the subjects' age group. Most of the subjects had been living in İstanbul for more than 15 years (55.90%). Among them, the largest group was the age group of 40-49 (Table 3.08).

Table 3.08. Distribution of the nonparticipants according to the years of residence in Istanbul by their age groups

| Age group | Years of Residence in Istanbul | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Less than 5 years | | 5-9 years | | 10-15 years | | More than 15 years | |
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| 14-19 | 8 | 17.8 | 3 | 7.5 | 3 | 5.3 | 18 | 10.0 |
| 20-24 | 12 | 26.7 | 7 | 17.5 | 10 | 17.5 | 22 | 12.2 |
| 25-29 | 11 | 24.4 | 12 | 30.0 | 13 | 22.8 | 27 | 15.0 |
| 30-39 | 8 | 17.8 | 12 | 30.0 | 19 | 33.3 | 31 | 17.2 |
| 40-49 | 5 | 11.1 | 4 | 10.0 | 8 | 14.1 | 54 | 30.0 |
| 50- | 1 | 2.2 | 2 | 5.0 | 4 | 7.0 | 28 | 15.6 |
| Total | 45 | 100.0 | 40 | 100.0 | 57 | 100.0 | 180 | 100.0 |

House ownership. Most of the subjects (51.39%) were living in their own houses (Table 3.09). Nearly half of the subjects were living in rented houses.

Table 3.09. The distribution of the subjects according to the house ownership

| House ownership | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| Own house | 167 | 51.39 |
| Rental | 150 | 46.15 |
| Missing | 8 | 2.46 |
| Total | 325 | 100.00 |

Ownership of another house. Although this question was asked only to the ones who owned a house, the ones who were

living in a rental house did also answer this question. 20.3% of the whole sample (n=66) did have another house; and 32.9% (n=107) did not have another house. Among the ones who owned a house 31.1% (n=52) had another house; and 62.3% (n=104) didn't have another house. Among the ones who were living in a rental house 8.7% (n=13) owned a house.

Perceived family financial status. Most of the subjects saw their family financial status as middle level (49.5%), then come the ones who saw their family financial status at low level (18.5%) (Table 3.10).

Table 3.10. The distribution of the subjects according to their perceived family financial status

| Perceived fam. fin. stat. | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| Low income | 60 | 18.5 |
| Below middle income | 50 | 15.4 |
| Middle income | 161 | 49.5 |
| Above middle income | 47 | 14.5 |
| High income | 6 | 1.8 |
| Missing | 1 | 0.3 |
| Total | 325 | 100.0 |

Perceived SES. This demographic characteristic is related with how the nonparticipants see their place in the society considering their jobs, educational level, the place they're living in, and income level. Most of the subjects saw their place in the society at a middle level (50.16%); then

come the ones who saw their place in the society above the middle level (18.15%) (Table 3.11).

Table 3.11. The distribution of the subjects according to their perceived levels of SES

| Perceived SES | f | % |
|---|---|---|
| Low level | 47 | 14.46 |
| Below middle level | 52 | 16.00 |
| Middle level | 163 | 50.16 |
| Above middle level | 59 | 18.15 |
| High level | 3 | 0.92 |
| Missing | 1 | 0.31 |
| Total | 325 | 100.00 |

The answers given to the questions of the type of institution they and their spouse were working in and the place they were living in were found not reliable. Most of the questions of the institution type were left empty; and the residential areas of the nonparticipants couldn't be classified according to a proper criterion. The current value of the quarters of each residence area would be an objective criterion but they weren't asked their quarters. Thus, these demographic characteristics couldn't be evaluated.

## Statistical Analysis

For the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach Alpha and item-total statistics were calculated; scale level reliability analyses were also carried out after the factors

have been generated. For the validity of the instrument, a factor analysis was carried out and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy were calculated. And finally, to determine the construct validity of the instrument and the effects of the demographic characteristics on the factors extracted, t-test and one-way ANOVA were conducted.

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION I

Results and Discussion part is divided into two parts. In this first part, the results are presented in terms of the following three research questions and a discussion is carried out accordingly.

1. Is the instrument RENOPAS a reliable instrument?
2. What are the major factors underlying nonparticipation?
3. Is the instrument RENOPAS a valid instrument?

## Results of the Reliability Study

In this part reliability study results are presented in three stages. The results of the first stage was related with the fourth form of RENOPAS, which consists of 74 items, and the second stage was related with the fifth form of RENOPAS, which emerged after some items were deleted at the end of the first stage. And finally, the third stage was related with the sixth form of RENOPAS which emerged after some items were deleted at the end of the factor analysis.

### First Step

By using the SPSS/PC+ statistical package the reliability coefficient Cronbach Alpha and item-total correlations of the fourth form of RENOPAS were calculated. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .9319. Items with item-total correlations below .20 were deleted,

which is a criterion usually used in most of the instrument development studies. These were items 2, 5, 13 and 14. Item 6 was not deleted, although it had an item-total correlation of .1499. Because the researcher found this item indispensable since it stated a reason suggested by the nonparticipants at the second step of the item generation process and by the experts at the third step of the item generation process. The item-total statistics are listed in the Appendix F. At the end of this stage the fifth form of RENOPAS with 70 items was generated.

## Second Step

After the items 2, 5, 13 and 14 were deleted, again, using the SPSS/PC+ statistical package Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient and item-total correlations of the fifth form of RENOPAS were calculated. Cronbach Alpha was found as .9338 (the item-total statistics are listed in Appendix G). As it is seen, Cronbach Alpha increased. The item-total correlation of item 6 also increased from .1499 to .1632, which would also be an acceptable item-total correlation. Because the criterion of item-total correlation of .15 is also preferred by some researchers.

## Third Step

In this step, Cronbach Alpha and item-total correlations were calculated after the items 12, 59 and 72 were deleted at the end of the factor analysis study. This factor analysis procedure was carried out after items 2, 5, 13 and 14 were

deleted as it is explained in the following pages. Cronbach Alpha of this final form was found as .9323. Although the reliability coefficient sligthly decreased (from .9338 to .9323), it is still very high and higher than that in the first step. Item-total correlation of item 6 also increased from .1632 to .1667. The item-total statistics are listed in Appendix H.

It can be said that this instrument has a very high internal consistency. As it is known the more reliable an instrument, the less the error is there in the measurement. According to Nunnally (1978) the major source of error within an instrument is due to inadequate sampling of items which also gives an opinion about the content validity of the instrument. Thus, it can be concluded that in the way the instrument to have high content validity, this reliability coefficient is promising. Another criterion for the reliability of the instrument is the relationship of the scores obtained with this instrument and the errorless true scores. The square root of coefficient alpha, which is .9656 for this instrument, is identified as the estimated correlation of this relationship. This, also indicates that the instrument has a very high reliability.

## Results of the Factor Analysis

After the items 2, 5, 13 and 14 were deleted, by using the statistical package SPSS for Windows 5.01, a factor analysis was carried out. The rotation method used was

varimax, and missing data were pairwise deleted. The criterion for factor extraction was the eigenvalues 1 or higher.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, which is a criterion for the adequacy of the given data for factor analysis, was found to be .87872, which was described as meritorious (Kaiser, 1974; cited in Kim & Mueller, 1987). This number ranges between 0 and 1. If it is 1, it implies that every variable can be predicted without error from other variables in the set. The guide for interpretation of this measure is as follows:

in the .90's marvelous
in the .80's meritorious
in the .70's middling
in the .60's mediocre
in the .50's miserable
below .50 unacceptable.

Principal components extracted 15 factors that met the criterion for retention (an eigenvalue of 1.0 or higher), accounting for 64.8% of the scale variance (factor loadings are given in Appendix I). Items with factor loadings at least .40 was accepted as belonging to that factor. And the items with factor loading less than .40 were deleted (Table 4.01).

Table 4.01. The deleted items and their highest factor loadings

| Item No. | Factor Loading |
|---|---|
| 12. Because my boss (employer) doesn't provide financial support that is necessary. | .39679 |
| 59. Because I can't decide on what subject I want to take a course. | -.33472 |
| 72. Because I don't want to be a student again. | .39951 |

# From 15 Factors to 8 Factors

In this part, the contents of 15 factors and the procedure of decreasing 15 factors to 8 factors are explained. During this procedure the contents of 15 factors were conceptually evaluated and factors were named. Through meaningful combination of some of these factors the number of factors were decreased to 8. This combination was based on the assumption that some of these 15 factors have common characteristics and are subdimensions of the 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial) that are given as conceptual definitions to the judges during the content validity stage. Thus, in this part, the congruency between the 15 factors and judges' factors is presented as well. 15 factors including the items with the item numbers, factor loadings and factor numbers given by the judges during the content validity stage can be seen in Appendix J. These numbers were given according to the conceptual definitions of 4 factors; situational (1), institutional (2), informational (3) and psychosocial (4).

When compared with the classification of the judges, it can be seen that the contents of 15 factors have some congruency with the judges' factors.

Factor 1 was named as financial contraints. There were 7 items. The items of this factor were related with scarcity or lack of financial resources which would also be labeled as situational barriers. All of the items in this factor (7 of 7) were put into the category of situational barriers by the

judges during the content validity stage. That's why there is a full congruency with the judges' classification. This factor wasn't combined with any other factor and stayed as the same. Its name in the 8-factors solution was also financial constraints.

Factor 3 was also one of the factors that wasn't combined with any other factor and stayed the same in the 8-factors solution. It was named as time constraints. There were 9 items in this factor. These items indicate general and job related time constraints which would also be labeled as situational barriers. Most of these items (7 of 9) were put into the category of situational barriers by the judges during the content validity stage. 2 of them were put into the category of psychosocial barriers. Although these two items contain some emotional dimensions and put into the category of psychosocial barriers by the judges, they are also related with the perception of the time wasted if given to the educational activities. This may be a result of a negative attitude towards educational activities but in light of the factor analysis it was perceived basically as an issue of limited time by the sample. Thus, it can be said that there is high congruency with the judges' classification.

Factor 4 is another factor that wasn't combined with any other factor and stayed the same in the 8-factors solution. It was named as fear and hesitation regarding the environment because the researcher thought that the lack of permission of the family is also associated with the fear and hesitation based on the social dynamics. This factor would be labeled as

a situational barrier because it is related with the situation of being married and living dependent on a family. It would also be labeled as a psychosocial barrier because it is also related with low self-confidence. There were 6 items in this factor. These items indicate fear and hesitation regarding the environment, especially the immediate environment, which also include no permission given by the family for participating. Half of 6 items of this factor were put into the category of situational barriers by the judges, 2 of them were placed into the factor of psychosocial barriers, and 1 of them was placed into the factor of institutional barriers. Although half of the items were put into the category of situational barriers by the judges, the name given by the researcher has psychological dimension. This factor wasn't seen as associated only with low self-confidence, because it was also highly related with social pressure difficult to surmount, which is based on the life and especially familial situations an individual is living in. The items named as situational barriers by the judges indicate lack of permission of the partner and mother-in-law as a barrier for not participating in adult education activities. The other two items named as psychosocial barriers by the judges are related with hesitation from the environment. And the item named as an institutional barrier by the judges, couldn't be conceptualized by the researcher for being under that factor by the factor analysis. There is not a high congruency with the judges' classification. Factor 8 was the last factor that wasn't combined with any other

factor and stayed as the same in the 8-factors solution. But it was renumbered as factor 7. It was named as family responsibility. This factor contained 4 items, that indicate feeling of family responsibility related with time desired to be with the family, household activities and finding no place for leaving the child to be taken care of, which hinder an adult from participating in adult education activities at least for some period of time. The items in this factor can be labeled as situational barriers because they were mostly related with the situation being married and obligations associated with familial life. All of these items (4 of 4) were put into the category of situational barriers. This factor was fully congruent with the judges' classification.

Original factors 2 and 10 were combined together and named as negative attitude towards educational activities as factor 2. Factor 2 was consisted of items related with the beliefs and thoughts that the available educational activities are neither useful, nor interesting or necessary. The items in factor 2 would be labeled as psychosocial barriers because they were related with thoughts about the activities' characteristics. Most of the items of factor 2 (8 of 10) were put into the category of psychosocial barriers by the judges during the content validity stage and 2 of them were put into the category of institutional barriers. But one of these 2 items was also loaded on another factor which was named as institutional barriers. Thus, factor 2 was also found to be very congruent with the judges' classification.

On the other hand, factor 10 consisted of items related with the thought that the available educational institutions are not qualified and cannot satisfy the subjects' needs. Most of the items of factor 10 (2 of 3) were put into the category of institutional barriers, and one of them was put into the category of psychosocial barriers by the judges. Although most of the items were put into the category of institutional barriers the contents of this factor's items was found to be associated with thoughts and beliefs. The item with the highest loading was indicating some belief that the institutions organizing the available courses are not of high quality. Moreover, factor 10 had an item in common with factor 2 which indicates the belief that no course desired is opened. Because all of these common characteristics the two factors are combined together and named as negative attitude towards educational activities (F2).

Original factors 5, 7, 9 and 11 were brought together and constituted factor 5 with the name of low self-confidence. Original factor 5 was consisted of the items related with age related negative perceptions, fear from new experiences and timidity. Most of these items (6 of 7) were put into the category of psychosocial barriers and one of them was put into the category of situational barriers by the judges. That one item was related with bad health conditions. There is a high congruency with the judges' classification.

Original factor 7 consisted of items related with the feelings of low personal competency. All of these items (6 of 6) were put into the category of psychosocial barriers

by the judges. This factor had one item in common with factor 5 and one item in common with factor 9. This factor is fully congruent with the judges' classification.

Original factor 9 consisted of items related with shyness and fear from new experiences. Most of these items (5 of 6) were put into the category of psychosocial barriers and one of them was put into the category of situational barriers by the judges. Although that one item was put into that category, it has some psychological dimension as well because it indicates the unwillingness for participating unless there is another person to go together, which would discourage an individual for participating in an educational activity. This factor was also found highly congruent with the judges' classification.

Original factor 11 consisted of items related with the feelings of low academic competency. All of these items (2 of 2) were put into the category of psychosocial barriers by the judges. This factor was fully congruent with the judges' classification as well. Because of the characteristics these factors have in common and since most of the items included in these factors were put into the category of psychosocial barriers they were thought as being subdimensions of feeling of low self confidence and were combined together. This factor was named as low self-confidence (F5).

Original factors 6 and 13 were also combined together and constituted factor 6 with the name of communicational barriers. Original factor 6 consisted of items related with

having no information about available educational activities. All of these items (5 of 5) were also put into the category of informational barriers during the content validity stage by the judges. This factor is fully congruent with the judges' classification.

Original factor 13 consisted of items related with uncertainty and unclear information about the educational activities. Most of these items (2 of 3) were put into the category of informational barriers and one of them was put into the category of psychosocial barriers by the judges. This item (20) indicates the fear from competition with the young students. Its association with communicational barriers can be such that it is a prejudice because a nonparticipant couldn't know the age level of course participants unless s/he didn't get into any communication with the institution; thus, this item indicates unclear information about the educational activity. So, it can be seen as a dimension of communicational barriers. This factor is also highly congruent with the judges' classification. Because of the characteristics these two factors have in common, they were combined together and constituted the factor of communicational barriers (F6).

Original factors 12, 14 and 15 were brought together and constituted factor 8 with the name of institutional barriers. Original factor 12 was consisted of items related with long course duration. All of these items (2 of 2) were put into the category of institutional barriers by the judges. This factor is fully congruent with the judges' classification.

The items in original factor 14 were related with the course instructors. One of these items (1 of 2) was put into the category of institutional barriers and the other item into the informational barriers by the judges. Although put into the category of informational barriers the item was evaluated as an institutional barrier. It states that the nonparticipant doesn't have much information about the instructors in those courses. It is such a statement that contains a feeling of untrustworthiness of the institution. For example, a nonparticipant may have negative information about the instructors of some institutions, which hindered him or her from participating, thus the statement of low information about the course instructors may be labeled as an institutional barrier.

The items in original factor 15 were related with the lack of course types desired and inconveniency of course locations. All of these items (2 of 2) were put into the category of institutional barriers by the judges. The institutions' characteristics mentioned in these items were thought as based on the institutional failures, thus all these three factors were brought together and named as institutional barriers (F8).

These 8 new factors and the items included in each factor with the item numbers, factor loadings and factor description are presented separately in the factor contents section.

There were some items that load with both factors. Because of the combination of some factors some of these

items were already included in one factor, some of these were included in both two factors, and the others were included in only one factor. These items are listed in the table 4.02.

Table 4.2. Items that load wit both factors with their factor loadings

| Item No. | Factor Number (factor loading) | |
|---|---|---|
| 19. Because I don't have information about the available adult education courses. | F6 (.59200) | F13 (.43269) |
| 21. Because I can't find any courses on subjects that I am interested in. | F2 (.55649) | F15 (.41601) |
| 41. Because I am afraid of being unsuccessful in the course. | F7 (.50342) | F9 (.63812) |
| 48. Because I think people around me would laugh at me if I participate in courses. | F4 (.47345) | F5 (.42580) |
| 56. Because no courses are offered I have desired. | F2 (.44673) | F10 (.40019) |
| 66. Because I see no necessity for participating in a learning activity. | F2 (.47961) | F5 (.45489) |
| 67. Because learning new things is difficult. | F5 (.45448) | F7 (.40985) |

After the combination of some factors only the items in the table 4.03 were loaded with two factors with the new factor numbers.

Table 4.03. The items loading with two factors after 15 factors were combined together

| Item No. | Factor Number (factor loading) | |
|---|---|---|
| 21. Because I can't find any courses on subjects that I am interested in. | F2 (.55649) | F8 (.41601) |
| 48. Because I think people around me would laugh at me if I participate in courses. | F4 (.47345) | F5 (.42580) |
| 66. Because I see no necessity for participating in a learning activity. | F2 (.47961) | F5 (.45489) |

The items 19, 41, 56 and 67 were already included in one factor because the two factors in which these items load separately were the constituents of the new combined factor.

In the final evaluation items 21 and 48 were included in both factors mentioned in the table, because these items were meaningfully related with both factors according to the researcher. Item 66 was included only in the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2), because this item had the highest factor loading on this factor and it was not meaningfully related with the factor of low self-confidence (F5).

## Factor Contents

In this part, 8 factors and the items included in each factor with the item numbers, factor loadings and factor description are presented. Additionally, numbers of 4 factors (1 for situational, 2 for institutional, 3 for

informational, 4 for psychosocial) that were given during the judges' classification are given in the tables.

Factor 1: Financial constraints. This factor contained 7 items with the mean score of 2.19 (Table 4.04). These items indicate the financial constraints, lack of financial support, scarcity or lack of financial resources and expensiveness of the activities as stated reasons for not participating in adult education activities.

Table 4.04. The items in the factor of financial constraints with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 1. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 60. Because I am not financially sufficient. | .87518 | 1 |
| 38. Because earning a living is of greater trouble. | .81579 | 1 |
| 39. Because courses are very expensive. | .81175 | 1 |
| 3. Because I think I can't afford the expenses necessary for the course. | .79852 | 1 |
| 52. Because transportation expenses are very high. | .76652 | 1 |
| 37. Because my family did not support me financially. | .70782 | 1 |
| 74. Because transportation is very difficult | .59764 | 1 |

Factor 2: Negative attitude towards educational activities. This factor includes 12 items with the mean score of 1.56 (Table 4.05). They indicate negative attitude to educational programs, courses as stated reasons, which include the beliefs and thoughts that the available educational activities are not useful, necessary, satisfactory and interesting.

Table 4.05. The items in the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 2. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 22. Because I don't believe the courses would provide me with opportunities | .70535 | 4 |
| 16. Because I don't believe the institutions organizing available courses are qualified. | .68552 | 4 |
| 17. Because I don't believe training would help me in my job/profession | .64556 | 4 |
| 26. Because I don't believe completing a course would help me in finding a job. | .62103 | 4 |
| 11. Because I am not interested in taking courses. | .60785 | 4 |
| 70. Such things do not cause to earn money. | .55874 | 4 |
| 21. Because I can't find any courses on subjects that I am interested in. | .55649 | 2 |
| 33. Because the courses are not sufficient for satisfying our needs. | .55091 | 2 |
| 53. Because I don't believe participating in courses would help increase my income | .54046 | 4 |
| 15. Because I find it unnecessary to participate in courses | .49450 | 4 |
| 66. Because I see no necessity for participating in a learning activity. | .47961 | 4 |
| 56. Because no courses are offered I have desired. | .44673 | 2 |

Factor 3: Time constraints. This factor contains 9 items with the mean score of 2.08 (Table 4.06). These items indicate general and job related time constraints as stated reasons for not participating in adult education activities.

Table 4.06. The items in the factor of time constraints with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 3. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 61. Because where I work is very busy. | .82456 | 1 |
| 44. Because there is nobody to take care of my job at work. | .80083 | 1 |
| 29. Because I get tired at work. | .77185 | 1 |
| 32. Because I don't have enough time for participating in courses regularly. | .66114 | 1 |
| 58. Because I can't get permission from the place. | .60802 | 1 |
| 1. Because I don't have the time for participation. | .58569 | 1 |
| 69. Because I have no extra time for such things. | .58463 | 4 |
| 30. Because I don't want to waste my time that is already very limited. | .54863 | 4 |
| 36. I have no time because I have another job. | .41493 | 1 |

Factor 4: Fear and hesitation regarding the environment.

This factor contained 6 items with the mean score of 1.22 (Table 4.07). These items indicate fear and hesitation regarding the environment, especially the immediate environment, which also include lack of permission of the family for participation. This factor was named as fear and hesitation regarding the environment because the researcher thought that the permission not given by the family is also associated with fear and hesitation regarding the environment based on the social dynamics.

Table 4.07. The items in the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 4. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 57. Because my mother-in-law don't allwo me to participate. | .71273 | 1 |
| 28. Because my family did not allow me. | .69638 | 1 |
| 7. Because my spouse don't allow me to participate. | .67151 | 1 |
| 71. Because the course instructor would be of the other sex. | .63152 | 4 |
| 43. Because I cant' usually find place in the courses. | .51253 | 2 |
| 48. Because I think people around me would laugh at me if I participate in courses. | .47345 | 4 |

Factor 5: Low self-confidence. This factor includes 18 items with the mean score of 1.33 (Table 4.08). These items indicate low self-confidence with the dimensions of timidity, shyness, feeling of low personal competency and negative age related perceptions as stated reasons for not participating in adult education activities.

Table 4.08. The items in the factor of low self-confidence with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 5. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 10. Because I think I won't understand the lectures. | .70685 | 4 |
| 25. Because I am old. | .68222 | 4 |
| 42. Because I think I would be bored. | .67263 | 4 |
| 46. Because people who are as old as me do not usually attend courses. | .65847 | 4 |
| 40. I wouldn't like to answer questions in front everybody in class. | .65501 | 4 |
| 62. Because I am not healthy. | .63610 | 1 |
| 41. Because I am afraid of being unsuccessful in the course. | .63812 | 4 |
| 49. Because I think I am lazy. | .63153 | 4 |
| 64. Because my reading and writing skills are not adequate. | .62915 | 4 |
| 9. Because I don't have confidence in my learning abilities. | .60686 | 4 |
| 31. Because my education is very poor. | .59554 | 4 |
| 63. Because I forget what I have learned very easily. | .56118 | 4 |
| 68. Because I feel shy in an unfamiliar environment. | .46943 | 4 |
| 51. If I take a course people would think that I am ignorant. | .46641 | 4 |
| 67. Because learning new things is difficult. | .45448 | 4 |
| 48. Because I think people around me would laugh at me if I participate in courses. | .42580 | 4 |
| 47. Because I think the courses are difficult. | .42159 | 4 |
| 34. Because I can't find anybody to attend courses together with me. | .40548 | 1 |

Factor 6: Communicational barriers. This factor contained 7 items with the mean score of 1.86 (Table 4.09). These items indicate lack of information about the course types and educational institutions as stated reasons for not participating in adult education activities. Previously, during the content validity stage there was a factor named as

informational barriers. This factor of communicational barriers is the changed version of informational barriers. Its name was changed to communicational barriers because the researcher thought that this barrier was seen as a two-way phenomenon which results from lack of communication between the nonparticipant and the institutions organizing adult education activities.

Table 4.09. The items in the factor of communicational barriers with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 6. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 65. Because I haven't heard about the courses offered. | .79701 | 3 |
| 27. Because I have never seen any advertisement about the courses opened in my environment. | .76145 | 3 |
| 50. Because I don't have information about the institutions organizing the courses. | .68070 | 3 |
| 19. Because I don't have information about the available adult education courses. | .59200 | 3 |
| 24. Because I don't know what kind of people attend such courses. | .51633 | 3 |
| 35. Because I don't know what is going on in these courses. | .48801 | 3 |
| 20. Because I think I can't compete with younger students. | .44953 | 4 |

Factor 7: Family responsibility. This factor contained 4 items with the mean score of 1.92 (Table 4.10). These items indicate the feeling of family responsibility related with time desired to be with the family, household activities and finding no place for leaving the child to be taken care of,

which hinder an adult from participating in adult education activities at least for some period of time.

Table 4.10. The items in the factor of family responsibility with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 7. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 45. Because I have to take care of my family. | .76659 | 1 |
| 18. Because I want to spend most of my time with my family. | .74218 | 1 |
| 55. Because I can't find time because of housework. | .64590 | 1 |
| 6. Because it's difficult for me to find any place to leave my children to be taken care of. | .61222 | 1 |

Factor 8: Institutional barriers. This factor included 6 items with the mean score of 1.44 (Table 4.11). These items indicate low course and institutional quality; low quality of course instructors; lack of course types desired; inconvenient course hours, long durations and course places as stated reasons for not participating in adult education activities.

Table 4.11. The items in the factor of institutional barriers with their factor loadings and factor numbers given during judges' classification into 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial)

| Factor 8. | Loading | Judges |
|---|---|---|
| 8. I have heard that the course instructors don't treat the course participants well. | .68795 | 2 |
| 4. Because I don't know the instructors in those courses well enough. | .65683 | 3 |
| 54. Because it takes too long to finish the courses. | .58691 | 2 |
| 73. Because course hours last too long. | .58307 | 2 |
| 23. Because the courses are at inconvenient locations. | .56302 | 2 |
| 21. Because I can't find any courses on subjects that I am interested in. | .41601 | 2 |

## Comparison of the 8-Factors Solution with the Judgmental Classification

In this part, at first the results of the forced factor analysis are compared. Then, the results of the 8-factors solution are compared with the judgmental classification.

SPSS was also forced to give a 4-factors solution of the items with varimax rotation and pairwise deletion of missing values. 4-factors solution accounted for 40% of the scale variance, which is less than that of 15-factors solution (64.8%), and the eigenvalues were equal or greater than 2.91655. The comparison of the results of the 4-factors solution and the judges' classification is given in the Appendix K. In the appendix, the four factors used during the judgmental classification are represented by the numbers, i.e. the situational barriers represented by 1, the

institutional barriers by 2, the informational barriers by 3 and the psychosocial barriers represented by the number of 4.

It is seen from the appendix, there are some items of which loadings were less than .40. These items are 4, 8, 10, 16, 23, 27, 31, 34, 36, 49, 54, 62, 64 and 73. As this is a criterion for deleting an item, and these items were found by the researcher as being indispensable, this forced factor solution was not found acceptable.

As explained before, 15 factors were reduced to 8 factors through meaningful combination of some factors by the researcher. The factor numbers of 15-and 8-factors solution is given in the Table 4.12 below.

Table 4.12. The reduction of 15 factors to 8 factors. The factor numbers in the 15-factors solution and 8-factors solution after the combination of the factors of 15 factors solution

| 15 factors solution | 8 factors solution |
|---|---|
| factor 1 | factor 1 |
| factor 2 10 | factor 2 |
| factor 3 | factor 3 |
| factor 4 | factor 4 |
| factor 5 7 9 11 | factor 5 |
| factor 6 13 | factor 6 |
| factor 8 | factor 7 |
| factor 12 14 15 | factor 8 |

The reduction of 15 factors to 8 factors through meaningful combination was based on the assumption that some of these 15 factors have common characteristics and are dimensions of the 4 factors (situational, institutional, informational, psychosocial) that are given as conceptual definitions to the judges during the content validity stage.

When the contents rather than the number of factors were taken into consideration, these 15 factors were found highly congruent with the judges' classification which would also be an evidence of the construct validity of the instrument. Since 15 factors were found highly congruent and some of them were combined together for the generation of 8 factors, the comparison of 8 factors with the judges' classification wouldn't be evidence for the construct validity. The reason for the comparison of 8 factors with the judges' classification is to give a general information about the congruency of 8 factors with the judges' classification. In the tables 4.4 to 4.11, the items of the 8-factors solution with their factor loadings, ranked from the highest to the lowest, and the factor numbers given by the judges to each item, are listed. In the tables, four factors used during the judgmental classification are represented by the numbers, i.e. the situational barriers represented by 1, the institutional barriers by 2, the informational barriers by 3 and the psychosocial barriers represented by the number of 4.

All items (7 of 7) of the factor of financial constraints (F1) were placed into the factor of situational barriers by the judges (Table 4.04). In this factor there is one-to-one congruence. The items of this factor can be labeled as situational barriers.

Most of the items (9 of 12) of the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) were placed into the factor of psychosocial barriers by the judges, and 3 of them were placed into the factor of institutional barriers

(Table 4.05). These items pinpoint the lack of course offerings desired and interested and that the courses that are offered not at the level that is satisfactory for their needs. These issues can be associated with negative attitude towards educational activities.

Of the factor of time constraints (F3) most of the items (7 of 9) were placed into the factor of situtational barriers by the judges, and 2 of these items were placed into the factor of psychosocial barriers (Table 4.06). Although these two items contain some emotional dimensions and put into the category of psychosocial barriers by the judges, they are also related with the perception that time would be wasted if given to educational activities. This may be a result of a negative attitude towards educational activities but in light of the factor analysis it was perceived basically an issue of limited time by the sample.

Half of 6 items under the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) were placed into the factor of situational barriers by the judges, 2 of them were placed into the factor of psychosocial barriers, and 1 of them was placed into the factor of institutional barriers
(Table 4.07). The items named as situational barriers by the judges indicate lack of family permission as a barrier for participating in adult education activities. The other two items named as psychosocial barriers by the judges are related with hesitation from the environment. And item 43 named as an institutional barrier by the judges was under this factor but no conceptualization could be developed by

the researcher to integrate it with the rest of items. Thus, as a result it was the least congruent factor among the eight factors. Although half of the items were put into the category of situational barriers by the judges, the name given by the researcher has a psychological dimension. Though this factor wasn't seen as associated with only low self-confidence, but also with social pressure difficult to surmount. These pressures derive from life events and especially familial situations of the individual experiences.

Most of the items (16 of 18) under the factor of low self-confidence (F5) were placed into the factor of psychosocial barriers by the judges while only 2 of these items were placed into the factor of situational barriers (Table 4.08). Although these two items were put into the category of situational barriers by the judges, they were associated to low self-confidence by the factor analysis. Because one of these two items is related with health problems which can negatively influence self-confidence in a negative way. And the other item indicates the unwillingness for participation unless there is another person to go together, which would discourage the individual to participate in an educational activity. This factor is one of the most congruent factors with the judgmental classification.

Most of the items (6 of 7) of the factor of communicational barriers (F6) were put into the factor of informational barriers by the judges, and one of these items was placed into the factor of psychosocial barriers

(Table 4.09). This item, indeed, indicates the fear from competition with the young students. It also reflects a prejudice because a nonparticipant couldn't actually know the age level of course participants. Thus, this item indicates unclear information about the educational activity and can be seen as a dimension of communicational barriers.

The factor of family responsibility (F7) has all of its items (4 of 4) placed under the factor of situtational barriers by the judges (Table 4.10). This factor was fully congruent with the judgmental classification.

And finally, most of the items (5 of 6) of the factor of institutional barriers (F8) were placed into the factor of institutional barriers by the judges, and 1 of these items was placed into the factor of informational barriers (Table 4.11). That item indicates that the nonparticipant doesn't have much information about the instructors in the adult education courses. But this statement is such a statement contains a feeling of lack of trust for the institution. For example, a nonparticipant may have negative information about the instructors at certain institutions and this hinders him or her from participating.

As a result, it can be said that there is a high congruency between the factor analysis results and judgmental classification, which is also a source of high construct validity.

# Comparison of RENOPAS with Other Studies

There were some foreign studies in which instruments were developed for the purpose of identifying reasons for not participating in adult education activities. In this part, the results of these foreign studies are compared with ours. Comparisons are made on the basis of the factors and the items constituting these factors.

The factor of financial constraints (F1) found in this study, which has the highest mean score (M=2.19), has items common with the factor of cost found by Martindale and Drake (1989). Some of the items in this factor have also similarities with the items of the factor of incidental costs found by Blais, Duquette, and Painchaud (1989). Yet this factor doesn't have much similarity with the factors found in foreign studies. But on the other hand, although no statistically reliable and valid instruments were used, in the studies conducted in Türkiye, this factor appeared as the lack of financial power (Okçabol, 1992-1993), lack of financial resources (Oğuzkan and Okçabol, 1987), and having no money (Ural, 1993). It cannot be directly concluded that financial constraints are more influential in Türkiye than in foreign countries, although our country is a developing country and the per capita income is relatively lower than that in those countries. It should not be forgotten that these barriers are the ones that are perceived and stated by the nonparticipants. It should also be remembered that educational activities in People's Education Centers are free

of charge. At this point, different dynamics related with the contents of the educational activities and characteristics of the institutions could be playing a role that should be taken into consideration, which are related with the other factors found in this study.

The factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2), which has the fifth highest mean score (M=1.56), have items common with the factors of negative attitude towards classes (Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988); lack of course relevance and lack of interest (Martindale and Drake, 1989); absence of external incentives and lack of information and affective support (Blais, Duquette and Painchaud, 1989); and low perception of need (Beder, 1990). Only some items are common with these studies. But basically there isn't a factor named as the attitude towards education except the one found by Hayes and Darkenwald (1988) and Martindale and Drake (1989). The factor of negative attitude towards educational activities consists mostly of the items related with the beliefs and thoughts that the educational activities are not useful and satisfactory. From this point of view, it can be said that our factor is similar to the factors found by Martindale and Drake (1989), Blais, Duquette and Painchaud (1989) and Beder (1990).

The factor of time constraints (F3), which has the second highest mean score (M=2.08), share some items with the factors of situational barriers (Beder, 1990); low personal priority (Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988); time constraints (Martindale and Drake, 1989), and incidental costs, low

priority for work-related activities (Blais, Duquette and Painchaud, 1989). Among these, only the factor of time constraints found by Martindale and Drake (1989) is similar as a whole, but even this factor is different. Our factor is significantly related with subjects who are having an occupation. On the other hand, the factor found by Martindale and Drake consists of time constraints related with the general population.

The factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) including items related with lack of family permission, which has the lowest mean score (M=1.22), have common items with the factors of negative attitude to classes (Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988); perceived effort (Beder, 1990); lack of information and affective support (Blais, Duquette and Painchaud, 1989); and lack of encouragement (Martindale and Drake, 1989). No such specific factor as fear and hesitation regarding the environment was found in foreign studies. Since this factor consists of items related with lack of family permission which is not likely to be found in western countries, it can be concluded that this factor is a culture specific factor.

The factor of low self-confidence (F5), which has the seventh highest mean score (M=1.33), was also found as a specific factor by Hayes and Darkenwald (1988). Martindale and Drake (1989) found a similar factor and named it lack of confidence. The other factors that are similar to ours are the factor of irrelevance of additional formal education for professional practice, and lack of information and affective

support (Blais, Duquette and Painchaud, 1989), and low perception of need and perceived effort (Beder, 1990). It seems that low self confidence is a deterring factor but its perceived magnitude differs from population to population. In this study, its mean score is one of the lowest mean scores, like Martindale and Drake's study, but in Hayes and Darkenwald's study it is one of the most deterring factors.

The factor of communicational barriers (F6), which has the fourth highest mean score (M=1.81), have items common with the factors of perceived effort (Beder, 1990); lack of confidence and lack of encouragement (Martindale and Drake, 1989). The same factor was found by Blais, Duquette and Painchaud (1989), as well, and named as the lack of information and affective support, but it consists of two parts, one is the lack of information and the other is the lack of affective support. When compared with the factor found in this study, the factor found by Blais, Duquette and Painchaud (1989) is one of the least deterring factors, but the factor of communicational barriers is one of the most deterring factors in the present study. The biggest difference is the name of this factor. In this study, the name of the factor of informational barriers stated by Darkenald and Merriam (1982) was changed to communicational barriers because it was seen as a two-way process, in which the institution as well as the individual may have failures at the same time.

The factor of family responsibility (F7), which has the third highest mean score (M=1.92), share some items with the

factors of situational barriers (Beder, 1990; Hayes and Darkenwald, 1988), and family problems (Martindale and Drake, 1989). Only the factor of family problems found by Martindale and Drake (1989) appears as a separate construct, the factors of situational barriers have only some items in common. But the difference between the factor of family problems and family responsibility found in this study is that in the present study, household or familial obligations were called as responsibilities rather than problems.

The factor of institutional barriers (F8), which has the sixth highest mean score (M=1.44), has items common with the factors of lack of course relevance, time constraints and lack of convenience (Martindale and Drake, 1989), and incidental costs (Blais, Duquette and Painchaud, 1989). It seems that there isn't a separate factor named as institutional barriers found in foreign studies. Only some of the items pinpoint similar issues.

## Scale-Level Reliability Analysis

For each factor, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient and item-total correlations were calculated separately by using the SPSS/PC+ statistical package. In this part, these results are presented and discussed.

Factor 1: Financial constraints. This factor contains 7 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .9149. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.13. The internal consistency of this subscale is very high. Moreover, the item-total

correlations, ranging from .6308 to .8551, are also very high.

Table 4.13. Item-total statistics of the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 12.8897 | 32.7771 | .6998 | .5546 | .9063 |
| 37 | 13.4698 | 33.9928 | .6544 | .4616 | .9106 |
| 38 | 12.9039 | 30.7300 | .8006 | .6718 | .8954 |
| 39 | 12.7331 | 31.6892 | .7731 | .5992 | .8985 |
| 52 | 13.1815 | 32.4277 | .7657 | .6423 | .8995 |
| 60 | 13.0534 | 31.0221 | .8551 | .7505 | .8896 |
| 74 | 13.0285 | 33.8492 | .6308 | .5108 | .9131 |

Factor 2: Negative attitude towards educational activities. This factor contains 12 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .8401. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.14. This scale also has high internal consistency with high item-total correlations ranging from .3660 to .6229.

Table 4.14. Item-total statistics of the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11 | 16.7224 | 32.3655 | .4489 | .3769 | .8324 |
| 15 | 16.9359 | 32.7030 | .5596 | .4622 | .8248 |
| 16 | 16.8043 | 33.7008 | .3660 | .2039 | .8378 |
| 17 | 16.9004 | 32.7472 | .4656 | .2965 | .8307 |
| 21 | 16.6904 | 31.6431 | .5436 | .4104 | .8248 |
| 22 | 16.8683 | 31.8647 | .6229 | .4521 | .8199 |
| 26 | 16.8043 | 31.1651 | .5905 | .4340 | .8210 |
| 33 | 16.7900 | 32.7522 | .4767 | .3263 | .8299 |
| 53 | 16.6441 | 31.1229 | .5036 | .3576 | .8287 |
| 56 | 16.7189 | 31.5314 | .5194 | .3884 | .8268 |
| 66 | 16.8790 | 33.1282 | .4537 | .2946 | .8315 |
| 70 | 16.8826 | 32.2683 | .5156 | .3442 | .8270 |

Factor 3: Time constraints. This factor contains 9 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .8517. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.15. This Coefficient Alpha was also high, with the high item-total correlations ranging from .3520 to .7274.

Table 4.15. Item-total statistics of the factor of time constraints (F3)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 16.2918 | 38.0288 | .5015 | .3286 | .8431 |
| 29 | 16.7865 | 35.3685 | .6970 | .5375 | .8229 |
| 30 | 16.8470 | 38.7229 | .4715 | .3190 | .8457 |
| 32 | 16.3310 | 36.2365 | .6368 | .4918 | .8294 |
| 36 | 17.3843 | 41.1732 | .3520 | .1670 | .8548 |
| 44 | 16.7046 | 34.5374 | .6837 | .5928 | .8236 |
| 58 | 17.0142 | 38.0427 | .5033 | .3689 | .8429 |
| 61 | 16.5872 | 33.9433 | .7274 | .6264 | .8184 |
| 69 | 16.6584 | 37.3400 | .5433 | .3736 | .8390 |

Factor 4: Fear and hesitation regarding the environment. This factor contains 6 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .7845. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.16. Also this subscale has high internal consistency with high item-total correlations ranging from .3886 to .6445.

Table 4.16. Item-total statistics of the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 5.9466 | 4.4364 | .5662 | .4184 | .7438 |
| 28 | 5.8327 | 3.7541 | .6445 | .4534 | .7243 |
| 43 | 6.0071 | 5.1571 | .3886 | .2570 | .7826 |
| 48 | 6.0071 | 4.8214 | .5261 | .3528 | .7556 |
| 57 | 5.9751 | 4.2672 | .5819 | .3885 | .7396 |
| 71 | 6.0142 | 4.7141 | .5169 | .2999 | .7563 |

Factor 5: Low self-confidence. This factor contains 18 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .9086. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.17. This subscale has also very high internal consistency with high item-total correlations ranging from .4178 to .7174.

Table 4.17. Item-total statistics of the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 22.5658 | 55.4608 | .5422 | .5766 | .9045 |
| 10 | 22.5409 | 55.2278 | .5278 | .5986 | .9048 |
| 25 | 22.4982 | 54.7437 | .4850 | .4559 | .9061 |
| 31 | 22.3488 | 52.4851 | .5889 | .5142 | .9034 |
| 34 | 22.2705 | 54.3694 | .4219 | .2650 | .9092 |
| 40 | 22.4377 | 54.1184 | .5351 | .4780 | .9047 |
| 41 | 22.4733 | 53.2145 | .6471 | .5438 | .9014 |
| 42 | 22.3630 | 54.2249 | .5128 | .3771 | .9054 |
| 46 | 22.4377 | 52.9899 | .6141 | .5286 | .9023 |
| 47 | 22.4733 | 52.9359 | .7174 | .5989 | .8995 |
| 48 | 22.6584 | 55.0114 | .6844 | .6464 | .9019 |
| 49 | 22.5694 | 56.4103 | .4178 | .3233 | .9074 |
| 51 | 22.6655 | 54.5877 | .6716 | .6144 | .9017 |
| 62 | 22.4875 | 55.0650 | .4670 | .3437 | .9066 |
| 63 | 22.3986 | 52.6334 | .6567 | .5358 | .9010 |
| 64 | 22.5374 | 54.2066 | .5782 | .5070 | .9034 |
| 67 | 22.4840 | 53.1292 | .6933 | .5411 | .9002 |
| 68 | 22.5231 | 54.2504 | .6078 | .5020 | .9027 |

Factor 6: Communicational barriers. This factor contains 7 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .8338. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.18. This subscale also has a high internal consistency with high item-total correlations ranging from .3945 to .6658.

Table 4.18. Item-total statistics of the factor of communicational barriers (F6)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 19 | 10.5409 | 16.2421 | .6570 | .4453 | .7990 |
| 20 | 11.0605 | 18.6356 | .3945 | .2343 | .8378 |
| 24 | 11.0961 | 17.7514 | .5562 | .3782 | .8159 |
| 27 | 10.5943 | 16.5705 | .5481 | .3772 | .8177 |
| 35 | 10.9431 | 16.7753 | .6504 | .4731 | .8013 |
| 50 | 10.6726 | 16.2424 | .6163 | .4196 | .8057 |
| 65 | 10.5943 | 15.6134 | .6658 | .5255 | .7970 |

Factor 7: Family responsibility. This factor contains 4 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .7632. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.19. Although the number of items is few, this subscale also has high internal consistency with high item-total correlations ranging from .4827 to .6770.

Table 4.19. Item-total statistics of the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 6.0641 | 7.0245 | .4827 | .2632 | .7469 |
| 18 | 5.6228 | 6.6286 | .5107 | .3311 | .7341 |
| 45 | 5.4733 | 5.7073 | .6770 | .4725 | .6406 |
| 55 | 5.6228 | 6.0929 | .5845 | .3595 | .6949 |

Factor 8: Institutional barriers. This factor contains 6 items. Cronbach Alpha was found as .6607. The item-total statistics are listed in table 4.20. Although this subscale

has moderate internal consistency, item-total correlations ranging from .3131 to .5587 are very high.

Table 4.20. Item-total statistics of the factor of institutional barriers (F8)

| It. No. | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 8.6014 | 8.2977 | .3131 | .1859 | .6435 |
| 8 | 8.7687 | 8.6784 | .3474 | .1924 | .6368 |
| 21 | 8.3452 | 7.9268 | .3228 | .1321 | .6423 |
| 23 | 7.9288 | 7.1735 | .3668 | .1859 | .6322 |
| 54 | 8.1708 | 7.1350 | .4588 | .3144 | .5921 |
| 73 | 8.1139 | 6.6798 | .5587 | .3801 | .5507 |

Scale-level reliability analyses yielded satisfactory results. Except the factor of institutional barriers each subscale had high and very high alpha coefficients with high item-total correlations. But the factor of institutional barriers had a moderate alpha coefficient. When compared with the item-total correlations of the last whole form, except 10 items, all of the item-total correlations in the scale-level reliability analysis were higher. Interestingly, 5 of these 10 items were included in the factor of institutional barriers (F8) which has the lowest scale-level reliability coefficient.

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION II

In this second section of the results and discussion part the results of the following last research question are presented, and discussion is carried out accordingly.

4. Is there any effect of the selected demographic variables (sex, age, educational level, marital status, number of children, occupational status of the nonparticipant and his/her spouse, the type of institution the nonparticipant and his/her spouse were working in, residential area, the years of residence of the nonparticipant in Istanbul, house ownership, ownership of another house, perceived family financial status, perceived SES) on reasons for nonparticipation?

## The Effect of the Demographic Characteristics on the Factors

In order to see whether there is an effect of the demographic characteristics on the nonparticipation factors, t-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were carried out. Another aim of these analyses was to support the construct validity of RENOPAS. One-way Anovas were followed up generally by Scheffe technique (at .05 alpha level) to see between which groups significant differences exist, which was considered as the most conservative technique. However, in some of the one-way Anovas Scheffe technique at greater alpha levels was used when no significant difference was found

between any two group. And in some other analyses Student-Newman-Keuls technique at .05 alpha level was used which is a less conservative technique. In this part, the results of these analyses are presented separately and a discussion is carried out.

## The Effect of Sex

T-test analyses were carried out in order to test for the difference in the scores of each factor between the males and females (Table 5.01). Significant differences (at .000 to .004 alpha levels) were found on the following factors: time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and family responsibility (F7).

Males' scores are significantly higher than that of females on the factor of time constraints (F3). Except general time constraints, since this factor also includes job related time constraints, higher scores of males are understandable because there were more males who have an occupation when compared with the female sample. But it should not be forgotten that this factor is an influencing barrier for participating in adult education activities for females, as well.

Females' scores are higher than that of the males on the factors of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and family responsibility (F7). This can be due to the females' disadvantaged status in the society based on the power relationship between males and females in the family and in the society, which functions on their disadvantage.

These two factors are somewhat related because the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment also includes lack of family permission, especially by spouses and mothers-in-law. At this point the disadvantaged status of the females proves itself.

When the factor of family responsibility (F7) was taken into consideration separately females' higher scores can also be understood. Regarding the items included in the factor, it can be said that most of the familial obligations, especially the ones related with the children and household work, are taken by the females. This phenomenon, on its own, indicates the disadvantageous status of the females, as well.

Table 5.01. T-test results for males and females on the factors given

| | Female | | | Male | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factors | M | SD | n | M | SD | n | t | p |
| F3 | 1.86 | .735 | 162 | 2.31 | .708 | 157 | - 5.52 | .000 |
| F4 | 1.30 | .553 | 160 | 1.15 | .334 | 157 | 2.94 | .004 |
| F7 | 2.21 | .889 | 162 | 1.63 | .617 | 158 | 6.76 | .000 |

## The Effect of Age

One-way ANOVA was carried out to test for the difference between age groups on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (at .0000 to .0217 alpha levels) were found on the factors of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2), time constraints (F3), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6), family responsibility

(F7) and institutional barriers (F8). In all these analyses, Scheffe technique (at .05 and greater alpha levels) was used in order to see between which groups significant differences exist.

Table 5.02 shows that there was a significant difference between the age groups on the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) at .0028 alpha level.

Table 5.02. One-way ANOVA for the age groups on the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 4.8978 | 5 | .9796 | 3.7071 | .0028 |
| Within Groups | 82.1781 | 311 | .2642 | | |
| Total | 87.0759 | 316 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between the age group of 6 (50 or older) and the groups of 4 (20-24) and 2 (30-39) (Table 5.03). Subjects older than 49 scored significantly higher than the age group of 20-24 and 30-39. For the older adults negative attitude towards educational activities was more important as a nonparticipation reason. Although the age group 6 had the highest score on this factor, it cannot be said that the importance of this factor increases as the age increases. There is a significant difference only between the groups mentioned. The reason for the higher scores of the older adults may be that older people don't think education

will be useful for them. But younger adults still think that further education will be useful for them.

Table 5.03. The results of Scheffe procedure for the age groups on the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2)

| Mean | SD | n | Age groups | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.4371 | .4743 | 49 | 20-24 (2) | | | | | | |
| 1.4476 | .4339 | 70 | 30-39 (4) | | | | | | |
| 1.5379 | .6438 | 33 | 14-19 (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.5749 | .4996 | 69 | 40-49 (5) | | | | | | |
| 1.6011 | .5480 | 61 | 25-29 (3) | | | | | | |
| 1.8595 | .5460 | 35 | 50- (6) | * | * | | | | |

Table 5.04 shows that there is a significant difference between the age groups on the factor of time constraints (F3) at .0064 alpha level.

Table 5.04. One-way ANOVA for the age groups on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 9.0627 | 5 | 1.8125 | 3.2975 | .0064 |
| Within Groups | 172.0450 | 313 | .5497 | | |
| Total | 181.1077 | 318 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found only between the age group 4 (30-39) and 1 (14-19) (Table 5.05). The scores of the subjects between the ages of 30 and 39 were higher than that of the subjects between the ages of 14 and 19. Since this factor includes job related time constraints the source of

the significant difference may be the age group of 30-39 having more job responsibilities and more busy schedules when compared with the subjects in the age group of 14-19.

Table 5.05. The results of Scheffe procedure for the age groups on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Mean | SD | n | Age groups | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.7326 | .6570 | 32 | 14-19 (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.9410 | .7308 | 49 | 20-24 (2) | | | | | | |
| 2.0317 | .7348 | 35 | 50- (6) | | | | | | |
| 2.0370 | .7916 | 72 | 40-49 (5) | | | | | | |
| 2.2330 | .7197 | 62 | 25-29 (3) | | | | | | |
| 2.2738 | .7532 | 69 | 30-39 (4) | * | | | | | |

Table 5.06 shows that there is a significant difference between the age groups on the factor of low self-confidence (F5) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.06. One-way ANOVA for the age groups on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 6.1540 | 5 | 1.2308 | 7.0179 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 53.8417 | 307 | .1754 | | |
| Total | 59.9957 | 312 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between the age group 6 (50- ) and the rest of the groups. Subjects older than 49 scored higher than all other age groups (Table 5.07). Older subjects' self-confidence is not that much high for deciding

to participate in an educational activity. They may think that their competencies won't be sufficient for such an activity and that's why they hesitate from participating. Up to the age group of 25-29 there is a tendency that the importance of the factor of low self-confidence increases with the the age.

Table 5.07. The results of Scheffe procedure for the age groups on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Mean | SD | n | Age groups | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.2113 | .2565 | 51 | 20-24 (2) | | | | | | |
| 1.2593 | .3631 | 30 | 14-19 (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.2778 | .3261 | 58 | 25-29 (3) | | | | | | |
| 1.3103 | .4217 | 70 | 30-39 (4) | | | | | | |
| 1.3278 | .4111 | 70 | 40-49 (5) | | | | | | |
| 1.7173 | .7122 | 34 | 50- (6) | * | * | * | * | * | |

Table 5.08 shows that there is a significant difference between the age groups on the factor of communicational barriers (F6) at .0011 alpha level.

Table 5.08. One-way ANOVA for the age groups on the factor of communicational barriers (F6)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 9.3918 | 5 | 1.8784 | 4.1946 | .0011 |
| Within Groups | 137.9248 | 308 | .4478 | | |
| Total | 147.3166 | 313 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between the age group

6 (50- ) and 2 (20-24) (Table 5.09). Subjects older than 49 scored higher than the subjects between the ages of 20 and 24. Additionally, beginning from the age group of 25 to 29 a tendency can be seen that its importance increases with the age. For older subjects it becomes more difficult to communicate with educational institutions of the society. It's a two way phenomenon. While because of their feelings of low competency they could not establish better communication with the institutions it is also highly possible that the adult education institutions could not reach to the older adults effectively.

Table 5.09. The results of Scheffe procedure for the age groups on the factor of communicational barriers (F6)

| Mean | SD | n | Age groups | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.5327 | .6751 | 48 | 20-24 (2) | | | | | | |
| 1.6267 | .5455 | 31 | 14-19 (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.8214 | .5742 | 60 | 25-29 (3) | | | | | | |
| 1.8531 | .6255 | 71 | 30-39 (4) | | | | | | |
| 1.8571 | .7961 | 69 | 40-49 (5) | | | | | | |
| 2.1633 | .7203 | 35 | 50- (6) | * | | | | | |

Table 5.10 shows that there is a significant difference between the age groups on the factor of family responsibility (F7) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.10. One-way ANOVA for the age groups on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 26.4459 | 5 | 5.2892 | 8.8625 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 187.3971 | 314 | .5968 | | |
| Total | 213.8430 | 319 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between the age group 4 (30-39), and 1 (14-19) and 2 (20-24); the age group of 5 (40-49), and 1 (14-19) and 2 (20-24); the age group of 3, and 1 (14-19) and 2 (20-24). The age group 6 (50- ) doesn't differ from any group significantly (Table 5.11). Since this factor was mostly related with married subjects it is usual that for the older subjects this factor was more important. Especially for the subjects between the ages of 30 and 39 familial responsibilities were more important because this age group may have children that were more dependable.

Table 5.11. The results of Scheffe procedure for the age groups on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Mean | SD | n | Age groups | 1 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3561 | .4636 | 33 | 14-19 (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.5050 | .6823 | 50 | 20-24 (2) | | | | | | |
| 1.9571 | .7005 | 35 | 50- (6) | | | | | | |
| 2.0794 | .7980 | 63 | 25-29 (3) | * | * | | | | |
| 2.1181 | .8243 | 72 | 40-49 (5) | * | * | | | | |
| 2.1269 | .8986 | 67 | 30-39 (4) | * | * | | | | |

Table 5.12 shows that there is a significant difference between the age groups on the factor of institutional barriers (F8) at .0217 alpha level.

Table 5.12. One-way ANOVA for the age groups on the factor of institutional barriers (F8)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 2.8384 | 5 | .5677 | 2.6800 | .0217 |
| Within Groups | 65.2406 | 308 | .2118 | | |
| Total | 68.0790 | 313 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found between the age group 6 (50-) and and 1 (14-19) at .1 alpha level (Table 5.13). Subjects older than 49 scored significantly higher than subjects between the ages of 14 and 19. The source of this significant difference may be that adult education institutions cannot serve to the older adults effectively. The applications of these institutions are not satisfactory for the needs of the older adults. There is also a tendency that the importance of the institutional barriers increases with the age level.

Table 5.13. The results of Scheffe procedure for the age groups on the factor of institutional barriers (F8)

| Mean | SD | n | Age groups | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3160 | .4356 | 33 | 14-19 (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.3526 | .4820 | 47 | 20-24 (2) | | | | | | |
| 1.4044 | .4713 | 71 | 40-49 (5) | | | | | | |
| 1.4637 | .4211 | 61 | 25-29 (3) | | | | | | |
| 1.4861 | .4497 | 67 | 30-39 (4) | | | | | | |
| 1.6612 | .5128 | 35 | 50- (6) | * | | | | | |

## The Effect of Educational Level

One-way ANOVA was carried out to test the differences among the groups of different educational level on each factor. Significant differences (at .0000 to .0165 alpha levels) were found on the factors of financial constraints (F1), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7). In all these analyses Scheffe technique (at .05 alpha level) was used in order to see between which groups significant differences exist.

Table 5.14 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups of different educational level on the factor of financial constraints (F1) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.14. One-way ANOVA for the educational levels on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 36.7925 | 4 | 9.1981 | 12.1522 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 237.6698 | 314 | .7569 | | |
| Total | 274.4623 | 318 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 1 (primary school dropouts), and group 4 (high school graduates) and 5 (graduates of higher educational institutions); group 2 (primary school graduates), and group 4 (high school graduates) and 5 (graduates of higher educational institutions) (Table 5.15). Financial constraints seem to be more important for the subjects with lower educational level. As can be seen from the mean scores there is a tendency that the importance of the financial constraints increases as the educational level decreases. Since most of the primary school dropouts (88.9%) and primary school graduates (89.3%) have middle and below middle perceived family financial status, this tendency is usual.

Table 5.15. The results of Scheffe procedure for the educational levels on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Mean | SD | n | Educational level | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.7709 | .7965 | 53 | Higher Edu. Inst. Gr. (5) | | | | | |
| 1.8847 | .8577 | 88 | High School Gr. (4) | | | | | |
| 2.2049 | .8910 | 53 | Middle School Gr. (3) | | | | | |
| 2.5190 | .9131 | 98 | Primary School Gr. (2) | * | * | | | |
| 2.7566 | .8441 | 27 | Primary School Dropout (1) | * | * | | | |

Table 5.16 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups of different educational level on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) at .0165 alpha level.

Table 5.16. One-way ANOVA for the educational levels on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 2.5806 | 4 | .6452 | 3.0801 | .0165 |
| Within Groups | 65.1419 | 311 | .2095 | | |
| Total | 67.7225 | 315 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between group 2 (primary school graduates) and 5 (graduates of higher educational institutions) (Table 5.17). The primary school graduates' mean scores were higher than that of higher educational institutions' graduates. There is also a tendency that the importance of this factor increases as the educational level of the subjects decreases. It seems that educational level is to an extent effective for surmounting this barrier. Subjects with relatively higher educational levels tend to be more assertive and have less fear and hesitation regarding the environment.

Table 5.17. The results of Scheffe procedure for the educational levels on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Mean | SD | n | Educational level | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.0723 | .1835 | 53 | Higher Edu. Inst. Gr. (5) | | | | | |
| 1.1667 | .3549 | 87 | High School Gr. (4) | | | | | |
| 1.2692 | .4322 | 26 | Primary School Dropout (1) | | | | | |
| 1.2876 | .4990 | 51 | Middle School Gr. (3) | | | | | |
| 1.3148 | .6013 | 99 | Primary School Gr. (2) | * | | | | |

Table 5.18 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups of different educational level on the factor of low self-confidence (F5) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.18. One-way ANOVA for the educational levels on the factor of low self-condidence (F5)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 6.6013 | 4 | 1.6503 | 9.4911 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 53.3816 | 307 | .1739 | | |
| Total | 59.9829 | 311 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 1 (primary school dropouts), and group 4 (high school graduates) and 5 (graduates of higher educational institutions); group 2, and group 4 (high school graduates) and 5 (graduates of higher educational institutions) (Table 5.19). This factor seems to be more important for primary school dropouts and graduates when compared to high school graduates and higher educational institution graduates. There is also a tendency that the importance of low self-confidence as a non-participation reason increases as the educational level decreases. The reason of this phenomenon may be that subjects with relatively lower educational levels have relatively fewer years of formal education, and thus feel less confidence in their competencies, especially academic competencies.

Table 5.19. The results of Scheffe procedure for the educational levels on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Mean | SD | n | Educational level | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1750 | .2261 | 87 | High School Gr. (4) | | | | | |
| 1.1866 | .2852 | 53 | Higher Edu. Inst. Gr. (5) | | | | | |
| 1.3567 | .5145 | 50 | Middle School Gr. (3) | | | | | |
| 1.4807 | .5313 | 95 | Primary School Gr. (2) | * | * | | | |
| 1.5432 | .4493 | 27 | Primary School Dropout (1) | * | * | | | |

Table 5.20 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups of different educational level on the factor of communicational barriers (F6) at .0016 alpha level.

Table 5.20. One-way ANOVA for the educational levels on the factor of communicational barriers (F6)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 8.0475 | 4 | 2.0119 | 4.4847 | .0016 |
| Within Groups | 138.1716 | 308 | .4486 | | |
| Total | 146.2191 | 312 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between group 2 (primary school graduates) and 4 (high school graduates) (Table 5.21). Communicational barriers were more important for the primary school graduates when compared with the high school graduates as a barrier for participation. It can be said that there is insufficient and unhealthy communication between the subjects with relatively lower educational level

and adult education institutions. Adult education institutions cannot reach to these subjects effectively.

Table 5.21. The results of Scheffe procedure for the educational levels on the factor of communicational barriers (F6)

| Mean | SD | n | Educational level | | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.6118 | .5674 | 85 | High School Gr. | (4) | | | | | |
| 1.6886 | .6509 | 50 | Middle School Gr. | (3) | | | | | |
| 1.8077 | .6658 | 52 | Higher Edu. Inst. Gr. | (5) | | | | | |
| 1.9870 | .7546 | 99 | Primary School Gr. | (2) | * | | | | |
| 1.9894 | .6781 | 27 | Primary School Dropout | (1) | | | | | |

Table 5.22 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups of different educational levels on the factor of family responsibility (F7) at .0004 alpha level.

Table 5.22. One-way ANOVA for the educational levels on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 13.5739 | 4 | 3.3935 | 5.3235 | .0004 |
| Within Groups | 200.1601 | 314 | .6375 | | |
| Total | 213.7339 | 318 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 1 (primary school dropouts) and 5 (graduates of higher educational institutions); group 2 (primary school graduates), and group 5 (graduates of higher educational institutions) and 4 (high school graduates) (Table 5.23). When compared with group 5

(higher educational institution graduates), familial obligations are significantly more important for primary school dropouts and graduates. But when compared with high school graduates, only for the primary school graduates familial obligations become more important. When the mean scores were taken into consideration, we can say that there is a tendency that the importance of family reponsibility increases as the educational level decreases. This is also related with the perception of family concept. Subjects with relatively lower educational level may be more dependent on the family environment.

Table 5.23. The results of Scheffe procedure for the educational levels on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Mean | SD | n | Educational level | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.6557 | .6582 | 53 | Higher Edu. Inst. Gr. (5) | | | | | |
| 1.7529 | .7241 | 86 | High School Gr. (4) | | | | | |
| 1.8775 | .8737 | 51 | Middle School Gr. (3) | | | | | |
| 2.1324 | .8470 | 102 | Primary School Gr. (2) | * | * | | | |
| 2.2407 | .9289 | 27 | Primary School Dropout (1) | * | | | | |

## The Effect of Marital Status

T-test was carried out in order to test for the difference in the scores of each factor between the single and married subjects (Table 5.24). Divorced and widowed subjects were not taken into consideration because their number was small. Significant differences (at .000 to .019 alpha levels) were found on the following factors: financial constraints (F1), fear and hesitation regarding the

environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7).

Married subjects scored higher than the single subjects on the factor of financial constraints (F1). This significant difference may be due to the relatively higher financial burdens married people encounter with when compared with the single people.

Married subjects scored higher than the single subjects on the factor of family responsibility (F7). This is expected because they have a family and they have more familial obligations than the single subjects.

Married subjects scored higher than the single subjects on the factor of communicational barriers (F6). The underlying reason may be that because of heavy familial responsibilities married subjects couldn't establish healthy communication with related institutions. But this phenomenon does have another meaning that those institutions also could not serve to the families effectively.

Married subjects scored higher than the single subjects on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), as well. The reason for this significant difference may be that because this factor also includes lack of family permission. It is thought that this influence is mostly valid for the married female subjects.

Married subjects scored higher than the single subjects on the factor of low self-confidence (F5). This significant difference may be due to the relatively lower educational levels of the married subjects. Most of the married subjects

were primary school graduates (37%); and 11% of the married subjects were primary school dropouts. Because of this fact married subjects may have low confidence on their academic competencies.

Table 5.24. T-test results for single and married subjects on the factors given

| | Single | | | Married | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factors | Mean | SD | n | Mean | SD | n | t | p |
| F1 | 2.03 | .838 | 92 | 2.30 | .967 | 216 | - 2.37 | .019 |
| F4 | 1.13 | .251 | 92 | 1.27 | .533 | 213 | - 3.13 | .002 |
| F5 | 1.21 | .285 | 90 | 1.37 | .471 | 211 | - 3.63 | .000 |
| F6 | 1.64 | .579 | 90 | 1.89 | .722 | 212 | - 3.19 | .002 |
| F7 | 1.38 | .471 | 93 | 2.17 | .834 | 215 | -10.43 | .000 |

## The Effect of Number of Children

One-way ANOVA was carried out on the data obtained from married subjects in order to test for the difference between the groups with different numbers of children on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (at .0000 to .0321 alpha levels) were found on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7). In most of these analyses Scheffe technique (at .05 alpha level) was used in order to see between which groups significant differences exist. When no two groups were found significantly different from each other at .05 alpha level,

greater alpha levels were used, and Student-Newman-Keuls multiple ranges procedure at .05 alpha level was used.

Table 5.25 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different numbers of children on the factor of financial constraints (F1) at .0093 alpha level.

Table 5.25. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 12.2790 | 4 | 3.0698 | 3.4532 | .0093 |
| Within Groups | 184.0128 | 207 | .8890 | | |
| Total | 196.2919 | 211 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between group 4 (three children) and group 3 (two children). The married subjects with three children scored significantly higher than the ones with two children on the factor of financial constraints (F1) (Table 5.26). Although it seems that this factor was important for subjects with more children there is no other significant difference between other groups which would support that explanation. But if the scores of the groups were compared with the mean scores of the whole sample it can be seen that the married subjects with one or more children have scored above or close to the average which is 2.19; and the married subjects with no children have scored below the average. Thus, it can be said that there is a tendency that

this factor is relatively more important for the subjects having children, no matter how many, when compared with the subjects having no child. The reason may be that subjects with more children have more expenditures related with child rearing and these expenditures are perceived more important than expending money for an educational activity.

Table 5.26. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Mean | SD | n | Number of children | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.0357 | .9873 | 24 | No child | (1) | | | | | |
| 2.1794 | .9312 | 82 | Two children | (3) | | | | | |
| 2.2159 | .9605 | 45 | One child | (2) | | | | | |
| 2.3929 | .9210 | 20 | Four and more children | (5) | | | | | |
| 2.7666 | .9306 | 41 | Three children | (4) | | * | | | |

Table 5.27 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different numbers of children on the factor of time constraints (F3) at .0303 alpha level.

Table 5.27. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 6.1491 | 4 | 1.5373 | 2.7280 | .0303 |
| Within Groups | 116.6472 | 207 | .5635 | | |
| Total | 122.7964 | 211 | | | |

According to Student-Newman-Keuls multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found between group 2

(one child) and 3 (two children) at .05 alpha level on the factor of time constraints (Table 5.28). Subjects with one child scored higher than the subjects with two children. This significant difference could not be conceptualized by the researcher. It could not be understood why subject with fewer children scored higher than the subjects with more children.

Table 5.28. The results of Student-Newman Keuls procedure for the subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Mean | SD | n | Number of children | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.9097 | .7133 | 80 | Two children (3) | | | | | |
| 2.1924 | .8440 | 41 | Three children (4) | | | | | |
| 2.2356 | .7210 | 25 | No child (1) | | | | | |
| 2.2864 | .7245 | 45 | One child (2) | * | | | | |
| 2.3175 | .7867 | 21 | Four and more children (5) | | | | | |

Table 5.29 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different numbers of children on the factor of low self-confidence (F5) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.29. One-way ANOVA for for the subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 6.5318 | 4 | 1.6330 | 8.3048 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 39.7189 | 202 | .1966 | | |
| Total | 46.2507 | 206 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 5 (four and more children), and group 2 (one child), 1 (no child) and 3 (two children); group 4 (three children), and group 2 (one child) and 3 (two children) (Table 5.30). The married subjects with four or more children have scored significantly higher than the groups 2 (one child), 1 (no child) and 3 (two children). But married subjects with three children have scored significantly higher than only group 2 (one child) and 3 (two children). It seems that having one child or no child or two children doesn't make any difference in terms of the low self-confidence. But having three or more children does make a significant difference. It can be said that there is a tendency that the importance of this factor increases as the number of children increases. It cannot be given a clear explanation but when demographic characteristics of these subjects with relatively higher scores were taken into consideration it can be seen that most of the subjects with three children were primary school graduates (34.1%) and primary school dropouts (26.8%). And most of the subjects with 4 and more children were primary school graduates (50%) and primary school dropouts (33.3%). Since the factor of low self-confidence (F5) also includes low feeling of academic competency there is a possibility that having lower educational level created the significant difference mentioned above.

Table 5.30. The results of Scheffe procedure for the subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Mean | SD | n | Number of children | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.2134 | .2714 | 44 | One child | (2) | | | | | |
| 1.2489 | .3048 | 25 | No child | (1) | | | | | |
| 1.3016 | .3069 | 77 | Two children | (3) | | | | | |
| 1.5986 | .6578 | 40 | Three children | (4) | * | | * | | |
| 1.7249 | .7174 | 21 | Four and more children | (5) | * | * | * | | |

Table 5.31 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different numbers of children on the factor of communicational barriers (F6) at .0321 alpha level.

Table 5.31. One-way ANOVA for the subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of communicational barriers (F6)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 5.3031 | 4 | 1.3258 | 2.6942 | .0321 |
| Within Groups | 99.8907 | 203 | .4921 | | |
| Total | 102.1938 | 207 | | | |

According to Student-Newman-Keuls multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 4 (three children), and group 2 (one child) and 3 (two children) at .05 alpha level (Table 5.32). Subjects with three children scored higher than the subjects with one child and two children. Additionally, there is a tendency of increasing importance of the communicational barriers as the number of children increases. The underlying reason for the significant difference and the tendency mentioned may be that

subjects with more children could not establish healthy communication since they could not interest in educational activities because of their responsibilities regarding the children, and adult education institutions could not reach to the subjects with more children effectively, although these subjects should be one of the most important targets of these institutions.

Table 5.32. The results of Student-Newman-Keuls procedure for the subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of communicational barriers (F6)

| Mean | SD | n | Number of children | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.7143 | .6688 | 25 | No child | (1) | | | | | |
| 1.7575 | .6017 | 43 | One child | (2) | | | | | |
| 1.8407 | .6783 | 78 | Two children | (3) | | | | | |
| 2.0340 | .8155 | 21 | Four and more child. | (5) | | | | | |
| 2.1672 | .7940 | 41 | Three children | (4) | | * | * | | |

Table 5.33 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different numbers of children on the factor of family responsibility (F7) at .0075 alpha level.

Table 5.33. One-way ANOVA for the subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 9.3709 | 4 | 2.3427 | 3.5850 | .0075 |
| Within Groups | 134.6155 | 206 | .6535 | | |
| Total | 143.9864 | 210 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between group 5 (four and more children) and 1 (no child) (Table 5.34). Married subjects with four and more children have scored significantly higher than the ones with no child. But if the average of the whole sample was taken into consideration, it can be seen that only the married subjects with no child have scored below the average, where the average is 1.92. From this point of view, it can be seen that there is a tendency that the importance of the factor of family responsibility (F7) increases as the number of children increases. This may be due to the relationship that the more children married subjects have the more familial responsibilities they have.

Table 5.34. The results of Scheffe procedure for the subjects with different numbers of children on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Mean | SD | n | Number of children | | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.7308 | .5428 | 26 | No child | (1) | | | | | |
| 2.0667 | .7895 | 45 | One child | (2) | | | | | |
| 2.1768 | .8556 | 41 | Three children | (4) | | | | | |
| 2.2969 | .8085 | 80 | Two children | (3) | | | | | |
| 2.5395 | 1.0249 | 19 | Four and more child. | (5) | * | | | | |

## The Effect of Occupational Status

One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to test for the difference between the groups with different occupational status on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (from .0000 to .0321 alpha levels) were found on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-

confidence (F5) and family responsibility (F7). In all these analyses Scheffe (at .05 alpha level) and Student-Newman-Keuls technique (at .05 alpha level) were used in order to see between which groups significant differences exist.

Table 5.35 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different occupational status on the factor of financial constraints (F1) at .0321 alpha level.

Table 5.35. One-way ANOVA for for different occupational status on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 10.4982 | 5 | 2.0996 | 2.4780 | .0321 |
| Within Groups | 259.2818 | 306 | .8473 | | |
| Total | 269.7800 | 311 | | | |

According to Student-Newman-Keuls multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between blue collar workers and white collar workers at .05 alpha level (Table 5.36). Blue collar workers scored higher than the white collar workers on the factor of financial constraints (F1). The source of this significant difference is very obvious because blue collar workers have relatively lower earnings compared to the white collar workers.

Table 5.36. The results of Student-Newman-Keuls procedure for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Mean | SD | n | Occupational status | 5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.9245 | .8271 | 53 | White collar worker (5) | | | | | | |
| 1.9592 | .8938 | 14 | Retired (3) | | | | | | |
| 2.0539 | .8842 | 61 | Entrepreneur (6) | | | | | | |
| 2.2593 | 1.0049 | 81 | Housewife (2) | | | | | | |
| 2.3756 | .9087 | 89 | Blue collar worker (4) | * | | | | | |
| 2.5102 | .9988 | 14 | Unemployed (1) | | | | | | |

Table 5.37 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different occupational status on the factor of time constraints (F3) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.37. One-way ANOVA for different occupational status on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 55.2446 | 5 | 11.0489 | 28.2428 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 118.5370 | 303 | .3912 | | |
| Total | 173.7816 | 308 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 4 (blue collar worker) and, group 1 (unemployed), 2 (housewife) and 3 (retired); between group 6 (white collar worker) and, group 1 (unemployed), 2 (housewife) and 3 (retired); between group 5 (white collar worker) and, group 1 (unemployed), 2 (housewife) and 3 (retired) (Table 5.38). White collar workers, entrepreneurs and blue collar workers, in the ascending order, scored higher than all other groups. It

seems that having a job increases the importance of the factor of time constraints as a barrier for participating in adult education activities. This would be an expected result because working subjects, especially during the week, don't have time for any adult education activity. Since there is no courses with flexible timetables, especially in People's Education Centers, working people couldn't be served effectively.

Table 5.38. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Mean | SD | n | Occupational status | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1746 | .2454 | 14 | Unemployed | (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.5583 | .5906 | 81 | Housewife | (2) | | | | | | |
| 1.6587 | .4683 | 14 | Retired | (3) | | | | | | |
| 2.3508 | .6404 | 51 | White collar worker | (5) | * | * | * | | | |
| 2.3778 | .6286 | 60 | Entrepreneur | (6) | * | * | * | | | |
| 2.4182 | .7005 | 89 | Blue collar worker | (4) | * | * | * | | | |

Table 5.39 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different occupational status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.39. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 6.5656 | 5 | 1.3131 | 7.1921 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 54.9560 | 301 | .1826 | | |
| Total | 61.5215 | 306 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 2 (housewife) and, group 5 (white collar worker), 6 (entrepreneur) and 4 (blue collar worker) (Table 5.40). The housewives scored significantly higher than these groups. Since this factor also includes lack of permission by the spouse and mother-in-law this result is understandable. This can be interpreted as that the importance of this factor was based on the power relationship between the institution of family and housewives, which functions on their disadvantage.

Table 5.40. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Mean | SD | n | Occupational status | | 5 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.0472 | .1511 | 53 | White collar worker | (5) | | | | | | |
| 1.1190 | .2305 | 14 | Unemployed | (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.1282 | .2272 | 13 | Retired | (3) | | | | | | |
| 1.1389 | .3697 | 60 | Entrepreneur | (6) | | | | | | |
| 1.1852 | .3125 | 90 | Blue collar worker | (4) | | | | | | |
| 1.4545 | .6854 | 77 | Housewife | (2) | * | | | * | * | |

Table 5.41 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different occupational status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5) at .001 alpha level.

Table 5.41. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 3.9149 | 5 | .7830 | 4.2446 | .0010 |
| Within Groups | 54.7856 | 297 | .1845 | | |
| Total | 58.7005 | 302 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between group 2 (housewife) and 5 (white collar worker) (Table 5.42). Similar to te previous factor 4 finding, because of their dependency on the family environment housewives also have feelings of low personal competency, shyness and timidity. This also may be due to the low educational level of the housewives because most of the housewives were primary school graduates (42%), 51.9% of them were below the level of middle school graduates, and 71.6% of the housewives were below the level of high school graduates.

Table 5.42. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Mean | SD | n | Occupational status | 5 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1363 | .1854 | 53 | White collar worker (5) | | | | | | |
| 1.3016 | .2754 | 14 | Unemployed (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.3052 | .3680 | 89 | Blue collar worker (4) | | | | | | |
| 1.3515 | .4755 | 58 | Entrepreneur (6) | | | | | | |
| 1.3932 | .4749 | 13 | Retired (3) | | | | | | |
| 1.4832 | .5715 | 76 | Housewife (2) | * | | | | | |

Table 5.43 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different occupational status on the factor of family responsibility (F7) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.43. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 48.3103 | 5 | 9.6621 | 17.9869 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 163.8376 | 305 | .5372 | | |
| Total | 212.1479 | 310 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 2 (housewife) and, group 1 (unemployed), 5 (white collar worker), 6 (entrepreneur) and 4 (blue collar worker) (Table 5.44). Housewives scored higher than all other groups except the retired subjects. There is not only a significant difference but also the only group that scored above the whole sample average is the group of housewives where the

average is 1.92. The mean score of housewives is very high (M=2.56). This may be due to the fact that housewives take most of the familial obligations which would also be a source of familial dependency of the housewife, and this hinders them from participating in adult education activities. This phenomenon also means that, institutions, especially People's Education Centers, don't provide child care services to decrease the negative effects of at least one of the familial obligations.

Table 5.44. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different occupational status on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Mean | SD | n | Occupational status | | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3214 | .4644 | 14 | Unemployed | (1) | | | | | | |
| 1.5519 | .5379 | 53 | White collar worker | (5) | | | | | | |
| 1.7008 | .6919 | 61 | Entrepreneur | (6) | | | | | | |
| 1.8258 | .7504 | 89 | Blue collar worker | (4) | | | | | | |
| 1.8929 | .6702 | 14 | Retired | (3) | | | | | | |
| 2.5563 | .8850 | 80 | Housewife | (2) | * | * | * | * | | |

## The Effect of the Spouse's Occupational Status

One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to test for the difference between the groups with spouse's different occupational status on the scores of each factor. The group of unemployed spouse was excluded because there was only one nonparticipant subject whose spouse was unemployed. Significant differences (from .0000 to .0287 alpha levels) were found on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5) and family

responsibility (F7). In all these analyses Scheffe technique (at .05 alpha level) was used in order to see between which groups significant differences exist. But in only one case Student-Newman-Keuls technique at .05 alpha level was used after Scheffe technique at greater alpha levels were tried and no significant difference was found, which is a less conservative technique.

Table 5.45 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of financial constraints (F1) at .0042 alpha level.

Table 5.45. One-way ANOVA for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 13.9335 | 4 | 3.4834 | 3.9514 | .0042 |
| Within Groups | 172.7854 | 196 | .8816 | | |
| Total | 186.7189 | 200 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 4 (blue collar worker) and, group 6 (entrepreneur) and 5 (white collar worker) (Table 5.46). The subjects whose spouses were blue collar workers scored higher than the subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs and white collar workers. This may be due to the fact that blue collar workers have relatively lower wages when compared with the white collar workers and

entrepreneurs. However, in order to say this, also the occupational status of the nonparticipants themselves have to be taken into consideration. Most of the subjects whose spouses were blue collar workers are housewives (60%) and blue collar workers (31.4%), thus they are dependent on their spouses and have lower earnings. On the other hand, most of the subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs are housewives (60%) and entrepreneurs (17%), and most of the subjects whose spouses were white collar workers are housewives (38.1%) and white collar workers (31%). While group 5 (white collar worker) consists of subjects who are not that much dependent on their spouses and have relatively higher earnings when compared to the subjects in group 4 (blue collar worker), subjects in group 6 (entrepreneur) are more dependent on their spouses but they already have higher earnings because of their spouses' and their occupational status. Thus, the significant difference can be understood.

Table 5.46. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Mean | SD | n | Spouse's Occup. Status | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2.0367 | .8883 | 35 | Entrepreneur (6) | | | | | |
| 2.1224 | 1.0173 | 42 | White collar worker (5) | | | | | |
| 2.1250 | .9315 | 16 | Retired (3) | | | | | |
| 2.3601 | .9420 | 74 | Housewife (2) | | | | | |
| 2.8204 | .8843 | 35 | Blue collar worker (4) | * | * | | | |

Table 5.47 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with spouse's different occupational

status on the factor of time constraints (F3) at .0087 alpha level.

Table 5.47. One-way ANOVA for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 8.0564 | 4 | 2.0141 | 3.5043 | .0087 |
| Within Groups | 111.5037 | 194 | .5748 | | |
| Total | 119.5601 | 198 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between the subjects whose spouses were housewives and subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs (Table 5.48). The subjects whose spouses were housewives scored higher than the latter ones. As can be realized, the former ones are only males and since most of these subjects (91.8%) were people working as blue collar, white collar workers and entrepreneurs this result is expected because these adults have more job responsibilities and busy schedules compared to other adults.

Table 5.48. The results of Scheffe procedure subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Mean | SD | n | Spouse's Occup. Status | | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.8698 | .7137 | 35 | Entrepreneur | (6) | | | | | |
| 1.9472 | .7310 | 40 | White collar worker | (5) | | | | | |
| 1.9583 | .7302 | 16 | Retired | (3) | | | | | |
| 2.1460 | .9050 | 35 | Blue collar worker | (4) | | | | | |
| 2.3607 | .7213 | 74 | Housewife | (2) | * | | | | |

Table 5.49 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) at .0108 alpha level.

Table 5.49. One-way ANOVA for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 2.9807 | 4 | .7452 | 3.3707 | .0108 |
| Within Groups | 42.6671 | 193 | .2211 | | |
| Total | 45.6477 | 197 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between group 6 (entrepreneur) and 2 (housewife) (Table 5.50). This may be due to the fact that 60% of the subjects whose partners were entrepreneurs, were housewives, and 94.3% of them were females. Since females and housewives, had high scores on this factor this result was expected. It is interesting that the group with the lowest score includes the subjects whose partners are housewives, i.e. males. Since the demographic variable sex also was effective on this factor, and females scored significantly higher than males, the phenomenon that this factor was important mostly for females proves itself.

Table 5.50. The results of Scheffe procedure subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Mean | SD | n | Spouse's Occup. Status | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1073 | .2662 | 74 | Housewife (2) | | | | | |
| 1.2236 | .3919 | 41 | White collar worker (5) | | | | | |
| 1.3229 | .6817 | 16 | Retired (3) | | | | | |
| 1.3480 | .5356 | 34 | Blue collar worker (4) | | | | | |
| 1.4265 | .6757 | 34 | Entrepreneur (6) | * | | | | |

Table 5.51 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5) at .0287 alpha level.

Table 5.51. One-way ANOVA for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 2.0899 | 4 | .5225 | 2.7689 | .0287 |
| Within Groups | 35.8531 | 190 | .1887 | | |
| Total | 37.9430 | 194 | | | |

According to Student-Newman-Keuls multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found between group 6 (entrepreneur) and 5 (white collar worker) at .05 alpha level on the factor of low self-confidence (F5) (Table 5.52). Subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs scored higher than the subjects whose spouses were white collar workers. The

researcher could not conceptualize this significant difference.

Table 5.52. The results of Student-Newman-Keuls procedure for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Mean | SD | n | Spouse's Occup. Status | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1865 | .1856 | 14 | Retired (3) | | | | | |
| 1.2520 | .4062 | 41 | White collar worker (5) | | | | | |
| 1.3158 | .4040 | 73 | Housewife (2) | | | | | |
| 1.4297 | .3434 | 34 | Blue collar worker (4) | | | | | |
| 1.5245 | .6326 | 34 | Entrepreneur (6) | | * | | | |

Table 5.53 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of family responsibility (F7) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.53. One-way ANOVA for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 20.9688 | 4 | 5.2422 | 8.8426 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 115.6033 | 195 | .5928 | | |
| Total | 136.5722 | 199 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 4 (blue collar worker) and 2 (housewife); and between group 6 (entrepreneur) and 2 (housewife) (Table 5.54). The subjects whose partners were blue collar workers and entrepreneurs

scored significantly higher than the subjects whose partners were housewives. This may be due to the fact that most of the subjects whose partners were entrepreneurs were female (94.3%) and housewives (60%), and most of the subjects whose partners were blue collar workers, were females (85.7%) and housewives (60%) and an important percentage was blue collar workers (31.4%). Since females and housewives scored significantly high on this factor this result is usual. Like on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment, also on this factor the subjects with the lowest score are the ones whose partners are housewives. This factor can be interpreted as being a disadvantage mostly for females, as well.

Table 5.54. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with spouse's different occupational status on the factor of family responsibility (F7)

| Mean | SD | n | Spouse's Occup. Status | | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.7637 | .6067 | 74 | Housewife | (2) | | | | | |
| 2.1463 | .7664 | 41 | White collar worker | (5) | | | | | |
| 2.1563 | .7685 | 16 | Retired | (3) | | | | | |
| 2.5000 | .9095 | 35 | Entrepreneur | (6) | * | | | | |
| 2.5571 | .9157 | 35 | Blue collar worker | (4) | * | | | | |

## The Effect of House Ownership

T-test analysis was carried out in order to test for the difference in the scores of each factor between the house owners and the tenants. Significant difference (at .000 alpha level) was found on the factor of financial constraints (F1) (Table 5.55). Tenants' scores were higher than that of the house owners on the factor of financial constraints. There

may be two reasons for the higher scores of tenants. One reason is self-evident that they were living in a rented house because they didn't have sufficient financial resources for buying a house. And the other reason could be that they pay very high rents, that's why they encounter with financial difficulties more.

Table 5.55. T-test result for the house owners and tenants on the factor given

| | House owner | | | Tenant | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | M | SD | n | M | SD | n | t | p |
| F1 | 1.98 | .906 | 165 | 2.43 | .912 | 149 | - 4.38 | .000 |

## The Effect of Ownership of Another House

T-test analysis was carried out in order to test for the difference in the scores of each factor only for the data gathered from the subjects who live in their own houses, between the ones who own another house and who don't own another house. Significant difference (at .001 alpha level) was found on the factor of financial constraints (F1) (Table 5.56). The subjects who don't own another house scored higher than the subjects who own another house on the factor of financial constraints. This result is also expected because living in one's own house does not necessarily mean that the factor of financial constraints won't be important for them. But there is an interesting point. Although there is a significant difference, the subjects owning only one house scored below the whole sample's average which is 2.19.

Table 5.56. Among the subjects who are living in their own houses, t-test result for the difference between the ones who own another house and who don't own another house on the factor given

| | Another House | | | No Another House | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Factor | M | SD | n | M | SD | n | t | p |
| F1 | 1.64 | .744 | 51 | 2.14 | .941 | 103 | - 3.31 | .001 |

## The Effect of the Perceived Family Financial Status

One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to test for the difference between the groups with different perceived family financial status on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (from .0000 to .0434 alpha levels) were found on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5) and institutional barriers (F8). In all these analyses Scheffe technique (at .05 and greater alpha levels) was used in order to see between which groups significant differences exist.

Table 5.57 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different perceived family financial status on the factor of financial constraints (F1) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.57. One-way ANOVA for for subjects with different perceived family financial status on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 83.2163 | 4 | 20.8041 | 33.7357 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 193.6372 | 314 | .6167 | | |
| Total | 276.8534 | 318 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 1 (low income) and, group 5 (high income), 4 (above middle income) and 3 (middle income); between group 2 (below middle income) and, group 5 (high income), 4 (above middle income) and 3 (middle income); and between group 3 (middle income) and 4 (above middle income) (Table 5.58). The subjects with low and below middle perceived financial status scored higher than the subjects with high, above middle and middle perceived financial status. Moreover, the subjects with middle perceived financial status scored higher than the ones with above middle perceived financial status. As it is seen from the table the importance of the factor of financial constraints increases as the perceived family financial status decreases. This is expected because lack of financial resources don't let people think to take an educational course. Courses may also be expensive. If people perceive his/her financial status as being insufficient they wouldn't think of their educational needs at first stage. There would also be significant differences with the subjects with high

perceived financial status but the number of subjects (n=6) at that level is too low to include in this analysis. These significant differences on this factor, which are very obvious, also indicate that RENOPAS has high construct validity in terms of discriminating these groups from each other.

Table 5.58. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different perceived family financial status on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Mean | SD | n | Family financial status | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3095 | .3877 | 6 | High income | (5) | | | | | |
| 1.5093 | .7497 | 46 | Above middle income | (4) | | | | | |
| 1.9814 | .7949 | 161 | Middle income | (3) | | * | | | |
| 2.7262 | .8229 | 48 | Below middle income | (2) | * | * | * | | |
| 2.9828 | .7797 | 58 | Low income | (1) | * | * | * | | |

Table 5.59 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different perceived family financial status on the factor of time constraints (F3) at .0434 alpha level.

Table 5.59. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different perceived family financial status on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 5.5756 | 4 | 1.3939 | 2.4887 | .0434 |
| Within Groups | 175.3057 | 313 | .5601 | | |
| Total | 180.8813 | 317 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found between group 1 (low income) and 3 (middle income) at .09 alpha level (Table 5.60). Subjects with low perceived family financial status scored significantly higher than the subjects with middle perceived family financial status. The source of this significant difference may be that subjects with low perceived family financial status had to work in additional jobs to earn more money and that's why have more busy schedules when compared to subjects with middle perceived family financial status.

Table 5.60. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different family financial status on the factor of time constraints (F3)

| Mean | SD | n | Family financial status | | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.7333 | .7722 | 5 | High income | (5) | | | | | |
| 2.0155 | .7061 | 158 | Middle income | (3) | | | | | |
| 2.0249 | .8238 | 49 | Below middle income | (2) | | | | | |
| 2.0520 | .7348 | 47 | Above middle income | (4) | | | | | |
| 2.3446 | .8012 | 59 | Low income | (1) | | * | | | |

Table 5.61 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different perceived family financial status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) at .0051 alpha level.

Table 5.61. One-way ANOVA for for subjects with different perceived family financial status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 3.1435 | 4 | .7859 | 3.7847 | .0051 |
| Within Groups | 64.5790 | 311 | .2076 | | |
| Total | 67.7225 | 315 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found only between group 1 (low income) and group 4 (above middle income) (Table 5.62). If this factor can be interpreted as another dimension of low self-confidence this result is understandable. For the subjects with relatively worse perceived family financial status this factor is more important when compared with subjects with better perceived family financial status. When subjects with high perceived financial status were disregarded. because their number was low. it can be seen that the importance of the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment increases as the perceived family financial status decreases. The significant difference and the tendency mentioned may be due to the relatively lower educational level of the subjects with low perceived family financial status because most of these subjects were primary school graduates (56.7%) and primary school dropouts (15%). But most of the subjects with above middle perceived family financial status were high school graduates and graduates of higher educational institutions.

Table 5.62. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different perceived family financial status on the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4)

| Mean | SD | n | Family financial status | | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.0580 | .1580 | 46 | Above middle income | (4) | | | | | |
| 1.1900 | .4259 | 157 | Middle income | (3) | | | | | |
| 1.3056 | .4139 | 6 | High income | (5) | | | | | |
| 1.3090 | .5248 | 48 | Below middle income | (2) | | | | | |
| 1.3729 | .6067 | 59 | Low income | (1) | * | | | | |

Table 5.63 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different perceived family financial status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5) at .0442 alpha level.

Table 5.63. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different perceived family financial status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 1.8725 | 4 | .4681 | 2.4773 | .0442 |
| Within Groups | 58.0130 | 307 | .1890 | | |
| Total | 59.8856 | 311 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found between group 1 (low income) and group 4 (above middle income) at .08 alpha level (Table 5.64). Subjects with low perceived family financial status scored significantly higher than the subjects with above middle perceived family financial status on the factor of low self-confidence (F5). Additionally, there is a

tendency that the importance of the factor of low self-confidence increases as the perceived family financial status decreases. The source of the significant difference and the tendency mentioned may be that low level of perceived family financial status may cause people to be less assertive and not confident of their competencies for taking a course. And since most of the subjects with low perceived family financial status were primary school graduates (56.7%) this result is also expected.

Table 5.64. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different family financial status on the factor of self-confidence (F5)

| Mean | SD | n | Family financial status | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.1944 | .2955 | 6 | High income | (5) | | | | | |
| 1.2174 | .3273 | 46 | Above middle income | (4) | | | | | |
| 1.3147 | .4444 | 155 | Middle income | (3) | | | | | |
| 1.3514 | .4610 | 46 | Below middle income | (2) | | | | | |
| 1.4680 | .4695 | 59 | Low income | (1) | | * | | | |

Table 5.65 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different perceived family financial status on the factor of institutional barriers (F8) at .0068 alpha level.

Table 5.65. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different family financial status on the factor of institutional barriers (F8)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 3.0479 | 4 | .7620 | 3.6129 | .0068 |
| Within Groups | 64.9583 | 308 | .2109 | | |
| Total | 68.0063 | 312 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 1 (low income) and, group 4 (above middle income) and 3 (middle income) (Table 5.66). Subjects with low perceived family financial status scored higher than the subjects with above middle and middle perceived family financial status. Subjects with high perceived family financial status can be disregarded because their number was low. At that point there is a tendency that the importance of the factor of institutional barriers increases as the perceived family financial status decreases. The association between perceived family financial status and the factor of institutional barriers cannot be exactly conceptualized by the researcher. But there is a high possibility that institutions' applications are not directed towards the subjects with lower perceived family financial status, which is against the aims of adult education and this creates a gap between the institutions and those subjects.

Table 5.66. The results of Scheffe procedure for the subjects with different perceived family financial status on the factor of institutional barriers (F8)

| Mean | SD | n | Family financial status | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3168 | .4106 | 46 | Above middle income | (4) | | | | | |
| 1.4103 | .4353 | 156 | Middle income | (3) | | | | | |
| 1.4348 | .5128 | 46 | Below middle income | (2) | | | | | |
| 1.5143 | .2962 | 5 | High income | (5) | | | | | |
| 1.6310 | .5176 | 60 | Low income | (1) | * | * | | | |

## The Effect of Perceived SES

One-way ANOVA was carried out in order to test for the difference between the groups with different perceived levels of SES on the scores of each factor. Significant differences (from .0000 to .0332 alpha levels) were found on the factors of financial constraints (F1) and negative attitude towards educational activities (F2). In all these analyses Scheffe technique (at .05 and greater alpha levels) was used in order to see between which groups significant differences exist.

Table 5.67 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different levels of perceived SES on the factor of financial constraints (F1) at .0000 alpha level.

Table 5.67. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different levels of perceived SES on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 78.3824 | 4 | 19.5956 | 31.0021 | .0000 |
| Within Groups | 198.4711 | 314 | .6321 | | |
| Total | 276.8534 | 318 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant differences were found between group 2 (below middle SES) and, group 5 (high SES), 4 (above middle SES) and 3 (middle SES); between group 1 (low SES) and, group 5 (high SES), 4 (above middle SES) and 3 (middle SES); and between group 3 (middle SES) and 4 (above middle SES) (Table 5.68). Almost the same relationship was found between perceived family financial status and the factor of financial constraints (F1). The only difference is that subjects with below middle perceived SES level scored highest but subjects with below middle perceived family financial status scored second. But there was not that much difference between these two groups. It can be said that there is a tendency that the importance of the factor of financial constraints (F1) increases as the perceived SES level decreases. This tendency was an expected relationship like in terms of perceived family financial status. This obvious finding on this factor was also an indicator of the high construct validity of RENOPAS in terms of discriminating these groups from each other.

Table 5.68. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different levels of perceived SES on the factor of financial constraints (F1)

| Mean | SD | n | Perceived SES | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3810 | .4364 | 3 | High SES | (5) | | | | | |
| 1.5896 | .6419 | 55 | Above middle SES | (4) | | | | | |
| 1.9877 | .8401 | 163 | Middle SES | (3) | | * | | | |
| 2.9006 | .8587 | 46 | Low SES | (1) | * | * | * | | |
| 2.9066 | .7452 | 52 | Below middle SES | (2) | * | * | * | | |

Table 5.69 shows that there is a significant difference between the groups with different levels of perceived SES on the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) at .0332 alpha level.

Table 5.69. One-way ANOVA for subjects with different levels of perceived SES on the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2)

| Source of Variation | Sum of Squares | Degree of Freedom | Mean Squares | F | p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between groups | 2.8744 | 4 | .7186 | 2.6542 | .0332 |
| Within Groups | 84.1981 | 311 | .2707 | | |
| Total | 87.0725 | 315 | | | |

According to Scheffe multiple ranges procedure significant difference was found between group 4 (above middle SES) and 1 (low SES) at .1 alpha level (Table 5.70). Subjects above middle SES scored higher than the subjects with low SES on the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2). Additionally, a tendency can be seen that the importance of the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities increases as the perceived SES level increases. The significant difference and the tendency mentioned may be interpreted as that although subjects couldn't participate in adult education activities because of financial constraints they don't have a negative attitude towards educational activities. They appreciate education because they have some expectations from education in order to gain a job skill for earning their lives.

Table 5.70. The results of Scheffe procedure for subjects with different levels of perceived SES on the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2)

| Mean | SD | n | Perceived SES | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.3582 | .4784 | 47 | Low SES | (1) | | | | | |
| 1.5196 | .5324 | 51 | Below middle SES | (2) | | | | | |
| 1.5902 | .5249 | 157 | Middle SES | (3) | | | | | |
| 1.6537 | .5210 | 58 | Above middle SES | (4) | * | | | | |
| 1.8333 | .7217 | 3 | High SES | (5) | | | | | |

Until now, the demographic characteristics that had significant effects on the factors were presented. There were also some demographic characteristics which didn't have any significant effect on any one of the factors. These demographic characteristics were the type of the institution the nonparticipant and his/her spouse were working in and the years of residence of the nonparticipant in Istanbul.

## An Overview on the Effects of the Demographic Characteristics

When the results mentioned until now were summarized it can be seen that there were some groups which were significantly different from other groups, for which some of the factors were very important as a barrier for participation. These groups are presented in the following pages. They were identified on the basis of significant mean differences on the factors, which were obtained by conducting t-tests and one-way ANOVAS.

The groups for which the factor of financial constraints (F1) was very important are the primary school dropouts and graduates; married subjects; married subjects with 3 children; blue collar workers; subjects whose partners were blue collar workers; tenants; subjects owning not more than one house; subjects whose perceived family financial status were at low, below middle and middle level; and finally subjects whose perceived SES levels were low, below middle and middle. As it is seen, mostly for disadvantaged groups and for groups that have relatively more responsibilities this factor has a high importance in terms of being a barrier on the way to participation.

The groups for which the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) was very important are the subjects whose ages are greater than 49; subjects with above middle level of perceived SES. From this point of view it can be seen that the groups which have disadvantages in terms of age and SES, basically state financial constraints as a barrier. But these subjects don't have a negative attitude towards educational activities. Instead, subjects with relatively higher SES see available educational activities as being not satisfactory, useful and necessary.

The groups for which the factor of time constraints (F3) was very important are males; subjects between the ages of 30 and 39; subjects having one child; blue collar workers, entrepreneurs and white collar workers; subjects whose spouses were housewives; and finally subjects with low perceived family financial status.

The groups for which the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) was very important are females; primary school graduates; married subjects; housewives; subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs; and finally subjects whose perceived family financial status was low.

Some of the groups for which the financial constraints (F1) were very important, were also the same for the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4). These groups were primary school graduates, married subjects and subjects with low perceived family financial status. From this point of view, the factors of financial constraints (F1) and fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) together can be interpreted as being related with each other.

The groups for which the factor of low self-confidence (F5) had an importance were the subjects whose ages were greater than 49; primary school dropouts and graduates; married subjects; subjects with 3 and more children; housewives; subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs and subjects with low perceived family financial status. Like the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), also the factor of low self-confidence (F5) was strikingly related with being married, a housewife, having a spouse as an entrepreneur, low educational level and low perceived family financial status. The factor of low self-confidence (F5) has a common characteristic with the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) as well. Factor 2 was also very important for the subjects whose ages were

greater than 49. Low self-confidence (F5) indicates another common characteristic with the factor of financial constraints (F1) in terms of being important for the subjects having 3 children, being married and having low educational level and low perceived family financial status. As can be seen, mostly for disadvantaged groups and groups that need education the most for bettering life quality, low self-confidence (F5) becomes very important as a barrier for participating in adult education activities. Although the aim of adult education is to serve to the disadvantaged adults and to the ones who need education the most this aim cannot be actualized sufficiently.

The factor of communicational barriers (F6) has an importance for the subjects older than 49; primary school graduates, married subjects and subjects having three children. This factor has common characteristics with the factors of financial constraints (F1), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and low self-confidence (F5). It has also common characteristics with the factors of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) and low self-confidence (F5) in terms of being as a barrier for subjects older than 49. Again, communicational barriers (F6) becomes important for subjects that need educational support, such as married subjects and subjects with low educational level and older adults.

The groups for which the factor of family responsibility (F7) was very important were females; subjects between the ages of 25 and 49; primary school dropouts and graduates;

married subjects; subjects with more than 4 children; housewives; and finally whose spouses were blue collar workers and entrepreneurs. This factor has relationship with the factors of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and low self-confidence (F5) in terms of being strikingly important for females, married subjects, housewives and adults with low educational level. Although these groups are in need of educational support they encounter with barriers for participating in adult education activities.

The factor of institutional barriers (F8) was very important as a barrier for the subjects older than 49 and subjects whose perceived family financial status is lower when compared with adults with higher perceived family financial status. From this point of view, it has common characteristics with the factors of financial constraints (F1) and fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4). Interestingly, as can be seen, although adults with low financial status has to be target population of the institutions, institutional barriers may exist for these people. Some institutional policies and applications can be barriers for their participation.

## Comparison with Other Studies

Only some of the factors found in this study are very similar to the ones found in other studies. That's why it is

not easy to compare the results of the effects of demographic variables on the factors with the factors in other studies. Thus, only the factors that are most similar to other studies are used for comparison.

The factor of financial constraints (F1) is very similar to the factor of cost found by Martindale and Drake (1989). In that study, a relationship was found only between the age and cost but in this study there was no significant effect of age on the factor of financial constraints (F1).

Another factor was negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) which was similar to the lack of course relevance found by Martindale and Drake (1989). In that study there was a significant relationship between age and that factor, which was also found in this study. Its importance increases with the age, which would mean that the more years subjects completed in the formal education the more negative attitude they have towards education. This may also be interpreted as a deficit of the educational system.

The factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) was also similar to the factor of negative attitude to classes found by Hayes and Darkenwald (1988). But interestingly, contrary to the findings of Martindale and Drake (1989) and this study, Hayes and Darkenwald (1988) found a significantly negative relationship between age and that factor.

The factor of low self-confidence (F5) was similar to the factor of lack of confidence found by Martindale and Drake (1989) and low self-confidence found by Hayes and

Darkenwald (1988). In the study of Martindale and Drake (1989) there was a significant relationship between that factor and educational level and age. And in the study of Hayes and Darkenwald (1988) there was a significant relationship between the factor mentioned and educational attainment and having a dependent child. Similar findings were found in this study. But different from the study of Hayes and Darkenwald (1988), in this study there was significant effect of specifically having 3 and more children on the factor of low self-confidence (F5).

Another comparison can be made with the studies of Johnstone and Rivera and educational testing surveys (1962 and 1972; cited in Darkenwald, 1982). The findings of those studies are very consistent with the ones of this study. On those studies lack of time, financial constraints, busy schedules, home and job responsibilities (in other words job related time constraints) and similar time related obstacles were also found as important barriers for participating in adult education activities.

Another consistency exists with the emphasis of Darkenwald and Merriam (1982), which is negative evaluation of oneself that is prevalent among the disadvantaged. This is consistent with the factor of low self-confidence (F5) found in this study. Especially adults with relatively lower educational levels, housewives, people with more than 3 children and adults with lower perceived family financial status scored higher in this factor.

Also the reasons of job demands, lack of financial power and lack of time found by Okçabol (1992-93); lack of financial resources, lack of time, job demands, family problems, being illiterate, unwillingness and being old found by Okçabol and Oğuzkan (1987); and the reasons of that subjects are still working, having no information, finding nobody to care of the children, having no time and having not enough financial power found by Ural (1993) are consistent with the findings of this study. These reasons were also important for some subgroups in this study.

# CONCLUSION

In this part, at first a summary about the whole study is given, then conclusions are made regarding the results of the study. Then the limitations of the study are presented, and finally some recommendations are made that would contribute to other studies in this area.

## Summary

The purpose of this study was to develop a valid and reliable instrument for identifying the adults' reasons and the magnitude of each reason for not participating in adult education activities, in other words for determining the barriers adults encounter with on the way to participation in educational activities; and to determine the effects of the demographic characteristics on the reasons for non-participation. This purpose was realized through five steps and the instrument was called as Reasons for Nonparticipation Scale (RENOPAS).

In the first three steps items were generated through the review of related literature; interviews made with non-participants; and interviews with 25 people who work in the field of adult education. At the end of these steps third form of RENOPAS was obtained.

In the fourth step, for the content validation of the instrument the third form of RENOPAS and the factors of situational, institutional, informational, and psychosocial

barriers with their conceptual definitions, were given to a group of 25 judges. According to their evaluation of the items some items were eliminated, some were revised and the fourth form of RENOPAS was obtained.

In the fifth step, for the reliability and construct validation of the instrument the fourth form of RENOPAS were administered to 325 nonparticipants. For the reliability of the instrument, Cronbach alpha and item-total statistics were calculated. Cronbach alpha of the last form was found as .9323.

For the construct validity of the instrument, factor analysis was carried out. 15 factors was extracted. Then, the number of these factors were decreased to 8 and named as financial constraints, negative attitude towards educational activities, time constraints, fear and hesitation regarding the environment, low self-confidence, communicational barriers, family responsibility and institutional barriers. For supporting the construct validity of RENOPAS the effects of demographic characteristics on all factors were tested by conducting t-tests and one-way ANOVAs.

Scale level reliability analysis was also carried out and its results were found satisfactory. Only the factor of institutional barriers had moderate scale-level reliability coefficient. The remaining 7 scales had high and very high reliability coefficients.

For supporting the construct validity of RENOPAS and to see the effects of the demographic characteristics on the factors t-test and one-way ANOVA were conducted. Except the

demographic characteristics of the type of the work place of the nonparticipant and their spouse, and the years of residence of the nonparticipant in Istanbul, various significant effects of the demographic characteristics were found on the factors.

Sex was found significantly effective on the factors of time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and family responsibility (F7). In terms of the factor of time constraints (F3) males scored higher than females. In terms of the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and family responsibility (F7) females scored higher than males.

Age was found significantly effective on the factors of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2), time constraints (F3), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6), family responsibility (F7) and institutional barriers (F8). In terms of the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) subjects older than 49 scored higher than the subjects between the ages of 20-24 and 30-39. In terms of the factor of time constraints (F3) subjects between the ages of 30-39 scored higher than the subjects between the ages of 14-19. In terms of the factor of low self-confidence (F5) subjects older than 49 scored higher than all other age groups. In terms of the factor of communicational barriers (F6) subjects older than 49 scored higher than the subjects between the ages of 20-24. In terms of the factor of family responsibility (F7) subjects between the ages of 25-29, 30-39 and 40-49 scored higher than the

subjects younger than 25. In terms of the factor of institutional barriers (F8) subjects older than 49 scored higher than the subjects between the ages of 14-19.

Educational level was found significantly effective on the factors of financial constraints (F1), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7). In terms of the factor of financial constraints (F1) primary school dropouts and primary school graduates scored higher than graduates of higher educational institutions and high school graduates. In terms of the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) primary school graduates scored higher than the graduates of higher educational institutions. In terms of the factor of low self-confidence (F5) primary school dropouts and graduates scored higher than high school graduates and higher educational institutions' graduates. In terms of the factor of communicational barriers (F6) primary school graduates scored higher than the high school graduates. In terms of the factor of family responsibility (F7) primary school dropouts scored higher than the graduates of higher educational institutions and primary school graduates scored higher than the graduates of higher educational institutions and high school graduates.

Marital status was found significantly effective on the factors of financial constraints (F1), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7).

On all factors married subjects scored higher than the single subjects.

Number of children was found significantly effective on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7). In terms of the factor of financial constraints (F1) subjects with three children scored higher than the subjects with two children. In terms of the factor of time constraints (F3) subjects with one child scored higher than the subjects with two children. In terms of the factor of low self-confidence (F5) subjects with four and more children scored significantly higher than the subjects with no child, one child and two children; and subjects with three children scored higher than the subjects with one child and two children. In terms of the factor of communicational barriers (F6) subjects with three children scored higher than the subjectes with no child and one child. In terms of the factor of family responsibility (F7) subjects with four and more children scored higher than the subjects with no child.

Occupational status was found significantly effective on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5) and family responsibility (F7). In terms of the factor of financial constraints (F1) blue collar workers scored higher than white collar workers. In terms of the factor of time constraints (F3) blue collar workers, entrepreneurs and white collar workers scored higher than the

unemployed, housewives and retired. In terms of the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) housewives scored higher than white collar workers, entrepreneurs and blue collar workers. In terms of the factor of low self-confidence (F5) housewives scored higher than the white collar workers. In terms of the factor of family responsibility (F7) housewives scored higher than all subjects except the retired.

Spouse's occupational status was found significantly effective on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5) and family responsibility (F7). In terms of the factor of financial constraints (F1) subjects whose spouses were blue collar workers scored higher than the subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs and white collar workers. In terms of the factor of time constraints (F3) subjects whose spouses were housewives scored higher than the subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs. In terms of the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs scored higher than the subjects whose spouses were housewives. In terms of the factor of low self-confidence (F5) subjects whose spouses were entrepreneurs scored higher than the subjects whose spouses were white collar workers. In terms of the factor of family responsibility (F7) subjects whose spouses were blue collar workers and entrepreneurs scored higher than the subjects whose spouses were housewives.

House ownership and ownership of another house were found significantly effective only on the factor of financial constraints (F1). Tenants scored higher than the house owners. The subjects who didn't own more than one house scored higher than the subjects who own more than one house.

Perceived family financial status was found significantly effective on the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5) and institutional barriers (F8). In terms of the factor of financial constraints (F1) subjects with low income and below middle income scored higher than the subjects with high income, above middle income and middle income; and subjects with middle income scored higher than the subjects with above middle income. In terms of the factor of time constraints (F3) subjects with low income scored higher than the subjects with middle income. In terms of the factor of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) subjects with low income scored higher than the subjects with above middle income. In terms of the factor of low self-confidence (F5) subjects with low income scored higher than the subjects with above middle income. In terms of the factor of institutional barriers (F8) subjects with low income scored higher than the subjects with above middle income and middle income.

Perceived SES was found significantly effective on the factors of financial constraints (F1) and negative attitude towards educational activities (F2). In terms of the factor of financial constraints (F1) the subjects with below middle

and low perceived SES scored higher than the subjects with high, above middle and middle perceived SES; and the subjects with middle SES scored higher than the subjects with above middle SES. In terms of the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) subjects with above middle SES scored higher than the subjects with low SES.

The most influential demographic characteristics were age, which is related with 6 factors. Then come the educational level, marital status, number of children, occupational status, spouse's occupational status and perceived family financial status each associated with 5 factors. Then comes the sex related with three factors as one of the most influential demographic characteristic.

The factor which was found as being more important for some subgroups among other factors is the factor of financial constraints (F1) which was influenced by 9 demographic characteristics. Then come the factor of low self-confidence (F5) and family responsibility (F7) which were effected by 7 demographic characteristics. The factors of time constraints (F3) and fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) were also important factors for some subgroups as reasons for non-participation. These factors were effected by 6 demographic characteristics each. Finally the factor of communicational barriers (F6) was found important for some subgroups, which was effected by 4 demographic characteristics. The least important factors were seen as the factors of negative attitude towards educational activities

(F2) and institutional barriers (F8) effected by two demographic characteristics.

## Conclusions

Reliability analyses, factor analysis, the comparison of the factors with the judges' classification and with other studies indicated that RENOPAS is a reliable instrument and has high content and construct validity. It can be applied to nonparticipants for general or specific purposes. But also it can be applied to the participants when they are asked to think about the reasons for non-participation in the past.

Regarding the demographic characteristics of the nonparticipants some groups seem attention drawing. For example, for primary school dropouts three factors have great importance as a barrier on the way to participation, namely financial constraints (F1), low self-confidence (F5) and family responsibility (F7). Primary school dropouts are one of the most important target populations of adult education because they have lost their chance for continuing with formal education. Adult education institutions play an important role for attracting these adults to adult education activities. Especially People's Education Centers, since they offer free activities, have to reach to these adults through functional literacy, cultural and vocational courses. Since the adults with relatively lower educational level have low confidence in their competencies, adult education institutions may play another important role. If these adults

don't come to take courses because of their low self-confidence, although they feel a necessity, adult education institutions must increase their effort and find new means to attract those adults. In terms of familial obligations these adults have disadvantages as well. Since some of these adults don't take courses because they couldn't find any place to take care of their children, adult education institutions have to take the responsibility to provide places and staff for taking care of the children. As a result, one of the first purposes must be to serve to these adults because they need a learning activity.

Another group consists of primary school graduates for which the factors of financial constraints (F1), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7) are very important as a barrier for participation. Like primary school dropouts, primary school graduates are also one of the important target populations of adult education. In addition to the factors that were also important for the dropouts, the factors of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and communicational barriers (F6) were important for the primary school graduates, as well. The things to do for reaching to the primary school dropouts is also valid for the primary school graduates. Additionally, there is an evidence that there is lack of communication between the adult education institutions and these adults because of the importance of the factor of communicational barriers (F6). Since the factor

of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) also includes lack of permission of the spouses and mothers-in-law another group is drawing attention among the primary graduates, which consists of women.

Married subjects also constitute another group for which many factors, namely financial constraints (F1), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5), communicational barriers (F6) and family responsibility (F7) have significant importance as being barriers for participation. Married subjects are also one of the most important target population of adult education since they raise children and have to be interested in their children's personality and physical development. Thus, the effort must come from the adult education institutions that will build connection with the experts on the field of child development.

Perceived family financial status is another important variable determining the degree of importance of some factors as being barriers for participation. For example for the subjects with low perceived family financial status the factors of financial constraints (F1), time constraints (F3), fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5) and institutional barriers (F8) have significant importance. The factor of financial constraints (F1) was one of the most important factors found in this study. When it is also related with the perceived family financial status and at the same time with the factor of institutional barriers (F8) an important problem draws

attention that adult education institutions cannot serve to the economically deprived adults effectively, which must also be one of the most important target populations of adult education.

Another group consists of housewives for whom the factors of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4), low self-confidence (F5) and family responsibility (F7) are very important in terms of being barriers on the way to participation. It is very interesting when these three factors come together and become significantly important for the housewives. From this point of view, although institutional barriers are not that much important for the housewives, there is an urgent need that the adult education institutions have to attract the housewives for taking courses on child rearing, and on the area of consciousness rising with the aim of surmounting negative effects of the power relationship between men and women in the family. It seems that housewives are in need of taking educational courses because they state reasons related with low confidence in personal competencies, especially academic competencies, but not negative attitude towards educational activities. When the familial obligations related with child care would be taken by the adult education institutions it would be easier for the housewives to participate in adult education activities.

The necessity that the adult education institutions, especially People's Education Centers, have to provide child care services, arises specifically for married subjects

having children as well. For the subjects with three children, the factors of financial constraints (F1), low self-confidence (F5) and communicational barriers (F6) have significant importance for being a barrier for participation. Also for married subjects having 4 and more children the factors of low self-confidence (F5) and family responsibility (F7) become significant barriers.

Females also appear to be worth mentioning for whom the factors of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and family responsibility (F7) are very important in terms of being barriers on the way to participation. From this point of view females are drawing too much attention. Since the factor of negative attitude towards educational activities (F2) was not important for females it can be said that they don't have negative attitude towards educational activities. and they feel the need for a learning activity, but familial obligations and the environmental pressure deter them from participating in adult education activities. It is more difficult for the adult education institutions lessening the effect of this deterrent than offering child care services but it is the duty and responsibility of the institutions to break these kinds of chains through planning and organizing consciousness rising activities.

Another important factor was the factor of time constraints (F3) especially for the working adults. Although this phenomenon can be interpreted as a pretext as well most of the working people really suffer for this barrier. Especially People's Education Centers have to take this

barrier into consideration and have to revise the hours and duration of their educational activities.

In summary, some recommendations can be made regarding the applications, target populations and educational policies. These recommendations have to be taken into consideration by the adult education institutions and especially by People's Education Centers.

1. For the purpose of reaching to the educationally deprived adults, institutions should generate secondary level literacy, functional literacy and vocational courses free of charge and other expenses specifically for these adults.

2. Institutions should increase their efforts and find new means to attract adults who don't have confidence in their competencies. They should reach to these deprived groups through personal communication and/or guidance services, and convince them that they are the target of the institutions.

3. First of all, institutions have to aim to reach to the economically deprived adults. Especially People's Education Centers have to increase the kinds of educational activities they offer regarding the economically deprived adults.

4. The state has to increase the budget share of the nonformal and adult education activities.

5. For married adults, since they raise children and have to be informed about their children's personality, social and physical development, institutions have to

organize educational activities on these subjects connected with the experts on these areas.

6. Institutions have to attract housewives to take courses on child rearing, and on the area of consciousness rising with the aim of surmounting negative effects of the power relationship between men and women in the family.

7. Institutions have to take the responsibility to provide child care services.

8. Regarding the working adults, institutions, especially People's Education Centers have to offer educational activities at later hours of the day, during the weekends and summer, as well. These centers cannot work like formal education institutions since their target population is the adults.

## Limitations

During the stage where interviews were carried out with 20 nonparticipants to generate some items, more nonparticipants would be included. But there was insufficient time. Though, it is assumed that the items generated during this stage measure what they are supposed to measure.

During the stage of the judges' classification all the academicians that are planned to be utilized could not be reached, which was another limitation. Because that stage was carried out during the summer and not all of them could be found in their work places and home. If more academicians

would be included in this study it would be very helpful for the content and construct validity of the instrument.

During the data collection about half of the subjects reached for the administration of the instrument rejected to take the instrument. Their reasons for rejection were lack of time, lack of permission by the husband, no desire to do that and that they can't understand such things. Perhaps this behavior implies some hesitation, prejudice or fear resulting from untrust. The researcher couldn't have get enough information about the adults who have rejected doing this instrument. Thus, it can be said that very different dynamics play important roles in the phenomenon of non-participation. But these different dynamics are not related only to the non-participation in educational activities but also to the non-participation in other social processes, which would be another research topic in that most of the adult educators should be interested.

One of the most important limitations was related with sampling method of the study. A combination of convenience and quota sampling methods was used in this study. Since they are not one of the random sampling methods, the results of this study cannot be generalized to all adults living in Istanbul.

## Recommendations

In the part of conclusions it was mentioned that RENOPAS can be used for general and specific purposes. When RENOPAS

was used for specific purposes, for example, for not participating in an in-service training program in a company some items that are irrelevant for the purpose can be eliminated. But in such cases reliability and factor analyses also must be carried out. Not only in such cases but also when the instrument is used without eliminating any item, reliability and especially factor analyses must be conducted again because all these analyses usually yield sample specific results. It is highly possible that new factors will emerge.

This instrument would highly be beneficiary for the People's Education Centers. Although most of these centers offer free educational programs the number of applicants is not as high as would expected. Thus, it would build a bridge between the adult population and the People's Education Centers to apply this instrument along a needs assessment tool in terms of determining the reasons of adults for nonparticipation and the type of educational activities and facilities which would be offered.

There is one important thing that must be taken into consideration. RENOPAS would be effective and yield satisfactory results when it is applied to subjects whose educational levels are higher than primary school graduates. The reason of this is that application to subjects with lower educational levels takes too much time because those people are not familiar with such scales well enough and mostly it takes time for them to understand how to do it. Most of the researchers in the adult education area has to take this

phenomenon into consideration. Otherwise, no bridge can be built with deprived adults who are in need of education. Flexible time allowed for making an in-depth interview with this population would be more effective. In-depth interviews especially with primary school graduates, dropouts and, of course, illiterates would help gain a broader view about the phenomenon of non-participation.

The effect of social desirability factor which is usually seen in such methods, where self-report techniques were used, can also be seen in this study. Subjects' mean scores on the factors of fear and hesitation regarding the environment (F4) and low self-confidence (F5) were the lowest ones. Although there was no hypothesis the researcher expected that the mean scores on these factors will be one of the highest ones. Though, some groups have drawn attention with their significantly different scores. That's why the researcher thinks that this is the result of social desirability factor. For lessening the effect of social desirability factor a more effective way can be recommended. Two different methods can be applied to two separate groups with the same socioeconomic status, like self-administration of an instrument and in-depth interviews. And then the results of these two methods can be compared.

In order to see how the adults can surmount barriers for participating in educational programs another method can be used. In this case, RENOPAS can be administered to the groups of adults who still participate in an adult education activity and non-participants separately. The difference

between two groups can be analyzed and additionally with the group of participants in-depth interviews can be done on how they surmounted the barriers on the way to participation.

In this study, factor analysis and one-way ANOVA were conducted in order to explain the phenomenon of non-participation. But for a further detailed explanation cluster analysis would be helpful. With the help of cluster analysis it would be possible to extract non-participant profiles according to demographic characteristics as well as the factors.

Another study would be conducted to identify the reasons for dropout because as said before in the introduction part, the theory of participation has three dimensions, namely the reasons for participation, the reasons for nonparticipation and the reasons for dropout. Such a study where reasons for dropout are identified will, of course, contribute to the theory of participation.

# REFERENCES

Atakan, N. C. (1982). An experimental survey study of attrition in the Turkish literacy campaign. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul.

Ayhan, S. (1988). Halk eğitiminde katılma. "Ankara'daki halk eğitimi merkezleri'nde açılan kurslara katılanların demografik özellikleri, katılmalarını güdüleyen etmenler ve programa ilişkin görüşleri". Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara.

Beder, H. (1990). Reasons for nonparticipation in adult basic education. Adult Education Quarterly, 40 (4), 207-218.

Bülbül, S. (1991). Yetişkinler için okuma-yazma öğretimi ve I. kademe eğitim kursları ile yetişkinler için II. kademe eğitimi kursları hakkında öğrenci, öğretmen ve ilköğretim müfettişlerinin görüşleri. "Seçilmiş illerde bir durum saptaması çalışması". MEB Çıraklık ve Yaygın Eğitim Genel Müdürlüğü, UNICEF ve Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi.

Blais, J-G., Duquette, A. & Painchaud, G. (1989). Deterrents to women's participation in work-related educational activities. Adult Education Quarterly, 39 (4), 224-234.

Darkenwald, G.G. & Merriam, S. B. (1982). Adult education: Foundation of practice. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

DIE, (1993). Genel nüfus sayımı: Nüfusun sosyal ve ekonomik nitelikleri. Ankara: DIE Matbaası.

DIE, (1992). Istatistik göstergeler, 1923-1990. Ankara: DIE Matbaası.

Gable, R. K. (1986). Instrument development in the affective domain. Boston/Dordrecht/Lancaster: Kluwer Nijhoff Publishing.

Hayes, E. R. (1988). A typology of low-literate adults based on perceptions of deterrents to participation in adult basic education. Adult Education Quarterly, 39 (1), 1-10.

Kim, J. & Mueller C. W. (1987). Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical Issues. Sage University Paper series on Quantitative Application in the Social Sciences, series no. 07-014. Beverly Hills and London: Sage Publications.

Lowe, J. (1975). The education of adults: A world perspective. Paris: UNESCO Press.

Martindale C. J. & Drake J. B. (1989). Factor structure of deterrents to participation in off-duty adult education programs. Adult Education Quarterly, 39 (2), 63-75.

McDaniel, R. H., Ed. & Others (1986). Barriers to rural adult education: A survey of seven northwest states. A report of the northwest action agenda project (Report No. 143). Washington, DC: Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. (From ERIC, 1986).

MEB, (1985). Milli eğitim istatistikleri, yaygın eğitim, 1982-1983. Ankara: DİE Matbaası.

MEB, (1988). Milli eğitim istatistikleri, yaygın eğitim, 1985-1986. Ankara: DİE Matbaası.

Munn, P. & MacDonald, C. (1988). Adult participation in education and training. Practitioner Minipaper. Evaluative Report. Scottish Council for Research in Education. (From ERIC, 1988).

Nunnally, Jum C. (1978). Psychometric theory. United States of America: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Oğuzkan, T. & Okçabol, R. (1987). Silivri ilçesinde yetişkinlerin öğrenme ilgi ve ihtiyaçları ile öğrenme tecrübeleri. Unpublished Research Report, Boğaziçi University Research Project No: 85/DO/504.

Okçabol, R. (1992-1993). Yetişkin eğitimi ve beceri kursları. Boğaziçi University Journal: Educational Sciences, Vol. 15. 17-36.

Pevoto, A. (1990). An exploratory study of nonparticipation by older adults in organized educational activities. TACSCE (Texas Association for Community Service and Continuing Education) Research Annual 1990, Vol. 6, No. 1, Fall 1990. (From ERIC, 1990).

Tekin, M. (1988). Ankara ilinde yetişkinleri örgün yetişkin eğitimi programlarına katılmaya güdüleyen etmenler ve yetişkinlerin katılmada karşılaştıkları güçlükler. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Ankara University, Ankara.

Titmus, C. J. (Ed.). (1989). Lifelong education for adults: An international handbook. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Ural, O. (1993). The reasons for participation in adult education programs in Türkiye. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Boğaziçi University, İstanbul.

# Appendix A

The interview form for 20 non-participants

1- İlkokul mezunu musunuz?

2- Şimdiye kadar hiç, okula öğrenci olarak gitmek dışında, özel kurumlar ya da devlet kurumları tarafından, örneğin Halk Eğitim Merkezleri tarafından açılan herhangi bir kursa, derse veya eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katıldınız mı? Örneğin muhasebe, bilgisayar, daktilo, sürücü, Kur'an, biçki dikiş, el sanatları, müzikle ilgili herhangi bir kurs, okuma yazma, hizmetiçi eğitim programı, kalorifer ateşçiliği kursu gibi...

## KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ MADDE OLUŞTURMA GÖRÜŞME FORMU

Görüşme yapılan kişinin yaşadığı yer
(ilçe, mahalle ya da sokak adı):_____

1. Cinsiyet: (1) Kadın (2) Erkek

2. Doğum tarihiniz? _____

3. Kaç yıldır İstanbul'da oturuyorsunuz? _____
   ( ) Doğduğumdan beri

4. İstanbul'a gelmeden önce nerede yaşıyordunuz? Yani İstanbul'a nereden geldiniz?

   İl _____
   Kasaba _____
   Köy _____

5. Medeni durumunuz?

   (1) Evli (2) Dul, eşi ölmüş
   (3) Boşanmış (4) Bekar
   (5) Başka (Belirtiniz) _____

6. (Evliyse) Çocuğunuz var mı? Kaç çocuğunuz var? _____

   (6) 5 çocuktan fazla (7) Yok

7. Evde siz dahil kaç kişi oturuyorsunuz? _____ kişi

8. Mesleğiniz?

   _____

   (1) İşsiz (2) Ev kadını (3) Emekli
   (4) Küçük Tüccar/Esnaf (5) Orta Tüccar/Esnaf
   (6) Büyük Tüccar/Esnaf (7) İşçi (8) Memur
   (9) Teknisyen (10) Zanaatkar
   (11) Başka (Belirtiniz) _____

9. Çalıştığınız yerde yaptığınız iş, konumunuz veya ünvanınız nedir?

10. (Evli ise) Eşinizin mesleği?

---

(1) İşsiz (2) Ev kadını (3) Emekli
(4) Küçük Tüccar/Esnaf (5) Orta Tüccar/Esnaf
(6) Büyük Tüccar/Esnaf (7) Özel sektörde işçi
(8) Kamuda işçi (9) Devlet memuru
(10) Zanaatkar (11)Teknisyen
(12) Başka (Belirtiniz) _____

11. Eşinizin çalıştığı yerde yaptığı iş, konumu veya ünvanı nedir?

12. Ailenizin maddi durumunu nasıl görüyorsunuz?

(1) Az gelirli (2) Ortanın altında
(3) Ortanın üstünde (4) Yüksek gelirli

13. Öğrenim durumunuz? Hangi okuldan mezunsunuz?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | İlkokul | (2) | ____'den terk |
| (3) | Ortaokul | (4) | ____'den terk |
| (5) | Meslek okulu orta kısmı | (6) | ____'den terk |
| (7) | Lise | (8) | ____'den terk |
| (9) | Meslek okulu lise kısmı | (10) | ____'den terk |
| (11) | Üniversite/Yüksekokul | (12) | ____'den terk |

14. Okula öğrenci olarak gitmek dışında bir yetişkin eğitimi faaliyetine yani özel kurumlar ya da devlet kurumları, örneğin Halk Eğitim Merkezleri tarafından verilen herhangi bir kursa, derse veya eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılmamanızın nedeni nedir? Katılmayışınızın sebeplerini teker teker açıklayabilir misiniz? (Önce geçmişte neden katılmadıkları sonra da şimdi neden katılmadıkları özellikle sorulacak) (Aklına başka bir neden gelmediğini söylerse, bazı hatırlatmalarda bulunulacak: aşağıda sıralanmış, daha önceden yapılmış araştırmalarda sınıflandırılmış bazı nedenler sayılacak ve bu konuda daha fazla konuşmaları sağlanacak.

aile, iş, arkadaş, ulaşım, sağlık, maddi engeller, eğitim kurumları, eğitim programları yani kursların durumu, eğitim programlarının kısıtlılığı, kurslardan haberi olmama, okula karşı tutum, geçmiş okul deneyimleri, kendine güvensizlik, utanma

# Appendix B

The interview form for 25 people working in the area of adult education

# YETIŞKINLERIN EĞITIME KATILMAMA NEDENLERI YETIŞKIN EĞITIMI ALANINDA ÇALIŞANLARLA GÖRÜŞME FORMU

Yetişkin nüfusun önemli bir kısmı (14 yaş üstü nüfus) bir yetişkin eğitimi etkinliğine katılmamaktadır; yani okula öğrenci olarak gitmek dışında devlet kurumları ya da özel kurumlar tarafından verilen herhangi bir kursa, veya eğitsel etkinliğe katılmamaktadır ya da katılamamaktadır.

Bu çalışma, bu olgunun nedenlerini, başka bir deyişle katılmalarına engel olan etkenleri saptamak amacıyla kullanılacak olan bir ölçeğin geliştirilmesiyle ilgilidir.

Sizin gibi yetişkin eğitimi alanında çalışan ve yetişkin hedef kitleyle bir şekilde karşı karşıya gelen ve yetişkinleri tanıyan kişilerle görüşerek, onların, hedef kitlenin herhangi bir yetişkin eğitimi etkinliğine katılmamalarının ya da katılamamalarının nedenleri konusundaki fikirlerini almanın gerekli olduğunu düşünüyorum. Bu nedenle bu ankete vereceğiniz içten yanıtlar benim için büyük önem taşımaktadır.

1. Kurum:
_____

2. Cinsiyet: ( ) Erkek ( ) Kadın

3. En son mezun olduğunuz okul: _____
_____

( ) Lise mezunu ( ) Lise dengi
( ) Üniversite _____
( ) Yüksekokul _____
( ) Yüksek lisans _____
( ) Doktora _____
( ) Diğer _____

4. Kurumdaki göreviniz: _____

( ) Yönetici ( ) Kadrolu öğretici
( ) Ücretli usta öğretici ( ) Müdür yrd. ( ) Müdür
( ) Diğer _____

5. Ne kadar zamandır bu görevi yürütüyorsunuz?: _____

6. Daha önce bu kurumdan başka bir yerde çalıştınız mı?

( ) Hayır çalışmadım
( ) Evet, yine yetişkin eğitimi alanında bir işte çalıştım
_____
( ) Evet, ama yetişkin eğitimi alanında çalışmadım
_____

7. (Daha önce yetişkin eğitimi alanında bir işte çalıştıysa) oradaki göreviniz neydi:

( ) Yönetici ( ) Kadrolu öğretici
( ) Ücretli usta öğretici ( ) Müdür yrd. ( ) Müdür
( ) Diğer _____

8. Çevrede yetişkinler için birçok kurs açılıyor. Bu kurslara hiç katılmayanlarla karşılaştığınızda, açılan kurslara neden katılmadıklarını ya da katılamadıklarını söyleyenler oldu mu? Ne gibi nedenler dile getirdiler?

9. Yetişkin nüfusun bir yetişkin eğitimi etkinliğine katılmamasının nedenleri ve/veya katılmalarına engel olan etkenler sizce neler olabilir? Bugüne kadar yaşamış olduğunuz deneyimler ışığında bu nedenlerin bazılarını sayabilir misiniz?

(Görüşülen kişiye kolaylık olması açısından, görüşme sırasında sık sık katılma nedenleri ya da engelleriyle ilgili aşağıdaki ana başlıklar hatırlatılarak görüşme sürdürülecek; söyledikleri aynen yazılacak)

-İşle ilgili engeller ya da nedenler
-Aileyle ilgili engeller ya da nedenler
-Arkadaş çevresiyle ilgili engeller ya da nedenler
-Maddi engeller
-Zaman sıkıntısı
-Ulaşım zorluğu (kişinin oturduğu yer ya da kursun bulunduğu yer)
-Sağlıkla ilgili engeller
-Eğitim ve öğretim kurumlarından kaynaklanan engeller;
  - Gereksinim duyulan kursların yokluğu
  - Eğitim programlarının zamanı ve düzenlendiği yerler
  - Eğitim kurumlarının politikaları ve uygulamaları
  - Eğitim etkinliklerinin duyurulması ya da tanıtımı
-Yetişkinlerin haber almakta gösterdikleri ihmal
-Yetişkinlerin eğitime karşı tutumları ya da tercihleri, düşünceleri, değer yargıları, önyargı
-Kendilerine duydukları güvensizlik, utanma, korku, öğrenememe ya da başarısızlık korkusu

15. Tanıdıklarınız arasında bir yetişkin eğitimi etkinliğine katılmayan varsa, sizce o tanıdıklarınız şimdiye kadar neden bir eğitim etkinliğine katılmamışlar? Neden katılmamış ve/veya neden katılmıyor olabilirler? (Aile bireylerinden başlayarak diğer tanıdıklara ve arkadaşlara geçilecek. Teker teker bunlar görüşme yapılan kişiye vurgulanarak sorulacak.)

Örneğin anneniz? Örneğin babanız?
Örneğin kardeşiniz? Örneğin eşiniz?
Örneğin çocuklarınız? Örneğin komşularınız?
Örneğin arkadaşlarınız?

# Appendix C

The form for the content validity given to the judges

## YETİŞKİNLERİN EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ

Bu çalışma, 14 yaş üzerindeki yetişkinlerin okul dışında yapılan bir yetişkin eğitimi etkinliğine, yani herhangi bir konuda devlet kurumları ya da özel kurumlar tarafından düzenlenen bir eğitim programına, örneğin bir kursa ya da kurs benzeri başka bir eğitim etkinliğine katılmamalarının nedenlerini, başka bir deyişle katılmalarına engel olan etkenleri araştırmak amacıyla kullanılacak olan bir ölçeğin geliştirilmesiyle ilgilidir.

Sizden, ilerideki sayfalarda karşınıza çıkacak olan maddeleri iki aşamada değerlendirmeniz istenmektedir.

**A.** İlk aşamada maddeleri ortak özelliklerine göre sınıflandırmanız istenmektedir. Bunun için, her maddenin aşağıda tanımlamaları yapılmış olan 4 faktörden hangisine daha uygun olduğunu, ilgili faktörün numarasını işaretleyerek belirtiniz. Bir maddeyi birden fazla faktöre uygun görseniz bile, lütfen o maddenin en çok hangi faktöre uygun olduğunu düşünerek sınıflandırmayı yapınız.

**FAKTÖRLER**

1. **DURUMSAL ENGELLER (DUR)**, bir bireyin, yaşamının belli bir döneminde, toplumsal ve fiziksel çevresinde oluşan koşullara bağlı olarak ortaya çıkan engellerdir. Bu engeller, kişinin karşı karşıya kaldığı sorunlar ya da taşımak zorunda olduğu sorumluluklar ve yükümlülükler olabilir. Toplumsal ve fiziksel çevreye örnek olarak gösterilebilecek olan çevrele aile, iş ve arkadaş ortamıdır. Maddi engeller, zaman sıkıntısı, ulaşım zorluğu, sağlıkla ilgili sorunlar diğer durumsal engellerden sayılabilir.

2. **KURUMSAL ENGELLER (KUR)**, belli bazı insan gruplarının öğrenme ve bir eğitim etkinliğine katılma yolunda cesaretini kıran, onları dışlayan ve engelleyen eğitim ve öğretim kurumlarından kaynaklanan engellerdir. Eğitim programlarının saatleri, süreleri ve yerleriyle ilgili engeller örnek olarak sayılabilir. Kurumların kurs türleriyle ilgili kararları, uygulamaları, politikaları ve eğitim programlarının nitelikleriyle ilgili engeller diğer kurumsal engellerdir.

3. **HABERLEŞME ENGELİ (HAB)**, kurumsal eğitim öğretim fırsatlarıyla ilgili bilgilerin ve haberlerin iletilmesinde, bunların yetişkinlere duyurulmasında ve tanıtılmasında kurumların gösterdiği hatalardır. Ancak, aynı zamanda teker teker bireylerin, eğitim öğretim etkinliklerini sunan kurumlardan haber ve bilgi almakta gösterdikleri eksiklik anlamına da gelir.

4. **PSİKOSOSYAL ENGELLER (PSİ)**, daha çok kişinin tutumu, eğilimleri ve öncelikli tercihleriyle ilgili engellerdir. Bunlar, insanları örgütlü öğretim ve eğitim etkinliklerine katılmaktan alıkoyan düşünceler, değerler, kişisel yeteneklerle ilgili inançlar, eğitime karşı tutumlar ya da eğitim olgusuyla ilgili algılamalardan oluşurlar. Önyargı, utanma ve kendine güvensizlik ya da kişinin yaşıyla ilgili algılamalar da bu engeller arasında sayılabilir.

Örnek:

| EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ | FAKTÖRLER | | | | FAKTÖRE UYGUNLUK DERECESİ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DUR | KUR | HAB | PSİ | Biraz uygun | Uygun | Çok uygun |
| Bir kurs ya da eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılmayı gerekli görmediğim için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

B. Bu aşamada, her madde için üç derece üzerinden bir **faktöre uygunluk puanı** veriniz. Faktöre uygunluk puanının derecelendirmesi aşağıdaki gibidir.

1: Bu madde bu faktöre biraz uygun
2: Bu madde bu faktöre uygun
3: Bu madde bu faktöre çok uygun

Yapacağınız sınıflandırma ve vereceğiniz faktöre uygunluk puanlarından yola çıkılarak, her maddenin ileride oluşturulacak olan "Eğitime Katılmama Nedenleri" ölçeğinde bulunmasının gerekip gerekmediği ve ölçeği oluşturan faktörlerin içeriği konusunda karar verilecektir.

Katkılarınızdan dolayı size şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Örnek:

| EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ | FAKTÖRLER | | | | FAKTÖRE UYGUNLUK DERECESİ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DUR | KUR | HAB | PSİ | Biraz uygun | Uygun | Çok uygun |
| Bir kurs ya da eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılmayı gerekli görmediğim için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

---

Adınız, Soyadınız : _____

Doğum yılınız : _____

Cinsiyetiniz : ( ) Erkek ( ) Kadın

Çalıştığınız üniversite: _____

Bölümünüz : _____

Akademik Ünvanınız : _____

Göreviniz : ( ) Araştırma Görevlisi ( ) öğretim Görevlisi ( ) öğretim Üyesi

Yüksek Lisans alanınız : _____

Doktora alanınız : _____

Şu anda çalışmakta olduğunuz alan : _____

| EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ | FAKTÖRLER | FAKTÖRE UYGUNLUK DERECESİ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DUR KUR HAB PSİ | Biraz uygun | Uygun | Çok uygun |
| 1. Kursa katılacak zamanım olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 2. Katılmayı istemediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 3. Kurs için gerekli olan harcamaları karşılayamayacağımı düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 4. Bu kurslardaki öğretmenler hakkında bilgim olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 5. Şimdiye kadar ilgimi çeken bir kursa rastlayamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 6. Hiç aklıma gelmemişti. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 7. Çocuklarımı bırakacak yer bulamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 8. Kursa gitmeme eşim izin vermediği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 9. Kurs öğretmenlerinin öğrencilere iyi davranmadığını duymuştum. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 10. Yaşlıları kurslara almadıklarını düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 11. öğrenme yeteneğime güvenmediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 12. Verilen dersleri kafamın almayacağını düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 13. Kurslara katılmaya ilgi duymadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 14. Patronum (işverenim) gerekli maddi yardımı yapmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 15. Şimdiye kadar katılmak istediğim kursların saatleri bana uymadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 16. Genellikle kendi başıma öğrenmeyi tercih ettiğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 17. Kurslara katılmayı gereksiz bulduğum için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 18. Mevcut kursları düzenleyen kurumların nitelikli olduğuna inanmadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 19. Eğitimin bana işimde/mesleğimde yardımcı olacağına inanmadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 20. Çocuğumuza/çocuklarımıza bakan eşimi yalnız bırakmak istemediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

| EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ | FAKTÖRLER | FAKTÖRE UYGUNLUK DERECESİ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DUR KUR HAB PSİ | Biraz uygun | Uygun | Çok uygun |
| 21. Mevcut yetişkin/halk eğitimi kursları hakkında bilgim olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 22. Kursların yapıldığı semtlerin güvenli yerler olmadığını düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 23. Genç öğrencilerle rekabet edemeyeceğimi düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 24. İlgi duyduğum konularda kurs bulamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 25. Kursların bana bir imkan sağlayacağına inanmadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 26. Rahatça gidebileceğim bir yerde kurs olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 27. Bu kurslara ne tür insanların gittiklerini bilmediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 28. Yaşlı olduğum için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 29. Arkadaş çevremden kimse destek olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 30. Bir kursu bitirmemin iş bulmama yardımı olacağına inanmadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 31. Mevcut kursların zamanıyla günlük programım birbirine uymadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 32. Kursların yapıldığı yerler bana yeteri kadar cazip gelmediği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 33. Çevremde açılan kurslarla ilgili duyurulara hiç rastlamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 34. Ailem izin vermediği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 35. İş yerinde çok yorulduğum için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 36. Zaten çok az olan boş zamanımdan fedakarlıkta bulunmak istemediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 37. Benim öğrenim düzeyim çok düşük olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 38. İhtiyaçlarımın çoğu iş sırasında bana öğretildiği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 39. Derslere düzenli bir şekilde katılamayacağımı düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

| EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ | FAKTÖRLER | FAKTÖRE UYGUNLUK DERECESİ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DUR KUR HAB PSİ | Biraz uygun | Uygun | Çok uygun |
| 40. Kurslar ihtiyaçlarımıza cevap verebilecek düzeyde değil | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 41. Ailemi yalnız bırakmak istemediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 42. Kursa birlikte gidecek insan bulamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 43. Bu kurslarda neler yapıldığını bilmediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 44. Yakınımızda kurs olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 45. Ek bir işte çalıştığım için zamanım yok. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 46. Ailem parasal destekte bulunmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 47. Geçim sıkıntısı daha ağır bastığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 48. Kursların niteliksiz olduklarını duymuştum. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 49. Kurslar pahalı olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 50. Sınıf içinde, herkesin ortasında, bana sorulacak soruları cevaplamak istemezdim. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 51. Ailemin kursa gitmemden hoşlanmayacağını düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 52. Kursta başarısız olmaktan korktuğum için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 53. Kurslardaki öğretmenlerin yetersiz olduklarını duymuştum. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 54. Sıkılacağımı düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 55. Kurslarda yer bulamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 56. Çalıştığım iş yerinde yerime bakacak kimse olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 57. Verebilecekleri ödevleri yapmaktan hoşlanmayacağım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 58. Çocuklarımla/çocuğumla ilgilenmem gerektiği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 59. Teşvik eden olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 60. Eğitime zaman ayırmak benim için bir lüks | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

| EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ | FAKTÖRLER | FAKTÖRE UYGUNLUK DERECESİ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DUR KUR HAB PSİ | Biraz uygun | Uygun | Çok uygun |
| 61. Yetişkin/halk eğitimi kurslarına giden benim yaşımda pek kimse olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 62. Eğitim gibi konularda kendime güvenemediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 63. Kurslarda öğretecekleri şeylerin bir işe yarayacağına inanmadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 64. Kursların çok zor olduğunu düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 65. Kurslara katıldığımda çevremdekilerin bana güleceğini düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 66. Tembel biri olduğumu düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 67. Bana yetecek kadar çok şey bildiğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 68. Kursları düzenleyen kurumlar hakkında bilgim olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 69. Kursa gidersem benim cahil olduğumu düşünürler. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 70. Ulaşım masrafları çok tuttuğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 71. Kurslara katılmanın benim ücretimin ya da maaşımın yükselmesine faydası olmayacağını düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 72. Kursları bitirmek uzun sürdüğü için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 73. Evdeki işlerden zaman bulamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 74. İstediğim konuda kurs açılmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 75. Kursa gitmeme kaynanam izin vermediği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 76. İş yerimden izin alamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 77. Hangi konuda kursa gitmek istediğime karar veremediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 78. Maddi gücüm yetersiz olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 79. Çalıştığım iş yerinde işler çok yoğun olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 80. Sağlığım bozuk olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 81. Oturduğum yer kursların düzenlendiği yerlere çok uzak olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

| EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ | FAKTÖRLER | FAKTÖRE UYGUNLUK DERECESİ | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | DUR KUR HAB PSİ | Biraz uygun | Uygun | Çok uygun |
| 82. Öğrendiklerimi çok çabuk unuttuğum için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 83. Benim ihtiyaçlarımı karşılayabilecek türden kurslara şimdiye kadar rastlayamadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 84. Okuma yazmam zayıf olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 85. Açılan kurslardan haberim olmadığı için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 86. Bir eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılma ihtiyacı duymadığım için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 87. Yeni şeyler öğrenmek zor geldiği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 88. Yabancı bir ortama girmekten çekindiğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 89. Böyle şeylere harcayacak zamanım yok. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 90. Kursların para tuzağı olduğunu düşündüğüm için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 91. Böyle şeyler para kazandırmaz. | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 92. Kurs öğretmeni karşı cinsten olabileceği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 93. Üst baş gerektirdiği için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 94. Yeniden öğrenci olmak istemediğim için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 95. Kurs saatleri uzun sürdüğü için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 96. Ulaşım zor olduğu için | (1) (2) (3) (4) | (1) | (2) | (3) |

# Appendix D

The fourth form of RENOPAS given to 325 non-participants

# YETİŞKİNLERİN EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ

Bu çalışma, yetişkinlerin okul dışında herhangi bir eğitim öğretim etkinliğine katılmasına engel olan nedenleri araştırmak için yapılmaktadır. Toplanan bilgiler kişisel değil toplu olarak araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilecektir.

Elinizdeki anket iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Gerekli açıklamalar her bölümün başında yapılmıştır.

Bana yardımcı olduğunuz için şimdiden size teşekkür ederim.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi
Araştırma Görevlisi
Cem Kirazoğlu

## 1. BÖLÜM

Bu bölümde sizinle ilgili bazı sorular sorulmaktadır. Lütfen her soruyu dikkatle okuduktan sonra size en uygun cevabın yanındaki parantezin içine çarpı işareti koyunuz.

1. Cinsiyetiniz: ( ) Kadın ( ) Erkek

2. Yaşınız aşağıdaki gruplardan hangisine uymaktadır?

( ) 14-19 ( ) 20-24 ( ) 25-29 ( ) 30-39 ( ) 40-49 ( ) 50 yaş ve üstü

3. Eğitim durumunuz?

| | |
|---|---|
| ( ) İlkokul mezunu | ( ) İlkokuldan terk |
| ( ) Ortaokul mezunu | ( ) Ortaokuldan terk |
| ( ) Meslek okulu orta kısmı mezunu<br>Okulun türü:_____ | ( ) Meslek ortaokulundan terk |
| ( ) Lise mezunu | ( ) Liseden terk |
| ( ) Meslek okulu lise kısmı mezunu<br>Okulun türü:_____ | ( ) Meslek lisesinden terk |
| ( ) Yüksekokul mezunu<br>Bölüm:_____ | ( ) Yüksekokuldan terk |
| ( ) Üniversite mezunu<br>Bölüm:_____ | ( ) Üniversiteden terk |
| ( ) Lisansüstü<br>Bölüm:_____ | |

4. Medeni durumunuz?

( ) Bekar ( ) Evli ( ) Boşanmış ( ) Eşi vefat etmiş

5. Çocuğunuz var mı? Varsa kaç tane?

( ) Yok ( ) 1 çocuk ( ) 2 çocuk ( ) 3 çocuk ( ) 4 ve daha fazla

6. Ne iş yapıyorsunuz? (İşsizseniz ya da ev kadınıysanız, işsiz ya da ev kadını diye yazınız) _____
(Örnek: Muhasebeci, vasıfsız işçi, tornacı, tezgahtar, şoför, elektrik mühendisi, işportacı vs.)

7. Çalıştığınız kurum ne tür bir kurum?

( ) özel bir firma ya da şirket ( ) Devlet kurumu ( ) Kendi işim

8. (Bu soruyu evliyseniz cevaplandırın) Eşiniz ne iş yapıyor? (İşsizse ya da ev kadınıysa, işsiz ya da ev kadını diye yazınız) _____
(Örnek: Muhasebeci, vasıfsız işçi, tornacı, tezgahtar, şoför, elektrik mühendisi, isportacı vs.)

9. (Bu soruyu evliyseniz cevaplandırın) Eşinizin çalıştığı kurum ne ne tür bir kurum?

( ) özel bir firma ya da şirket ( ) Devlet kurumu ( ) Kendi işim

10. Hangi semtte oturuyorsunuz? _____

11. Kaç yıldır İstanbul'da oturuyorsunuz?

( ) 5 yıldan az ( ) 5-9 yıl ( ) 10-15 yıl ( ) 15 yıldan fazla

12. Oturduğunuz ev sizin mi?

( ) Evet ( ) Hayır, kirada oturuyoruz

13. (Bu soruyu, ev sahibiyseniz cevaplandırın) başka sahip olduğunuz ev var mı?

( ) Evet ( ) Hayır

14. Ailenizin maddi durumunu nasıl görüyorsunuz?

( ) Az gelirli ( ) Ortanın altında ( ) Orta ( ) Ortanın üstünde ( ) Yüksek gelirli

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

( ) Alt düzey ( ) Ortanın altında ( ) Orta ( ) Ortanın üstünde ( ) Üst düzey

## 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 sayılardan 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 olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 2. Katılmayı istemediğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 3. Kurs için gerekli olan harcamaları karşılayamayacağımı düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 4. Bu kurslardaki öğretmenleri pek fazla tanımadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 5. Açılan kurslar ilgimi çekmediği için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 6. Çocuklarımı bırakacak yer bulamadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 7. Kursa gitmeme eşim izin vermediği için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 8. Kurs öğretmenlerinin kursiyerlere iyi davranmadığını duymuştum. ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 9. Öğrenme yeteneğime güvenemediğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 10. Verilen dersleri kafamın almayacağını düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 11. Kurslara katılmaya ilgi duymadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 12. Patronum (işverenim) gerekli maddi yardımı yapmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 13. Şimdiye kadar katılmak istediğim kursların saatleri uygun olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

| Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri | Hiç doğru değil | Biraz doğru | Oldukça doğru | Çok doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. Genellikle kendi başıma öğrenmeyi tercih ettiğim için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 15. Kurslara katılmayı gereksiz bulduğum için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 16. Mevcut kursları düzenleyen kurumların nitelikli olduğuna inanmadığım için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 17. Eğitimin bana işimde/mesleğimde yardımcı olacağına inanmadığım için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 18. Zamanımın çoğunu ailemle birlikte geçirmek istediğim için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 19. Mevcut yetişkin eğitimi kursları hakkında bilgim olmadığı için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 20. Genç öğrencilerle rekabet edemeyeceğimi düşündüğüm için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 21. İlgi duyduğum konularda kurs bulamadığım için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 22. Kursların bana bir imkan sağlayacağına inanmadığım için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 23. Rahatça gidebileceğim bir yerde kurs olmadığı için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 24. Bu kurslara ne tür insanların gittiklerini bilmediğim için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 25. Yaşlı olduğum için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 26. Bir kursu bitirmemin iş bulmama yardımı olacağına inanmadığım için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 27. Çevremde açılan kurslarla ilgili duyurulara hiç rastlamadığım için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 28. Ailem izin vermediği için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 29. İş yerinde çok yorulduğum için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 30. Zaten çok az olan boş zamanımı harcamak istemediğim için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 31. Benim öğrenim düzeyim çok düşük olduğu için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 32. Kurslara düzenli bir şekilde katılabilecek kadar zamanım olmadığı için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 33. Kurslar ihtiyaçlarımıza cevap verebilecek düzeyde olmadığı için | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

| Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri | Hiç doğru değil | Biraz doğru | Oldukça doğru | Çok doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. Kursa birlikte gidecek insan bulamadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 35. Bu kurslarda neler yapıldığını bilmediğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 36. Ek bir işte çalıştığım için zamanım yok. ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 37. Ailem parasal destekte bulunmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 38. Geçim sıkıntısı daha ağır bastığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 39. Kurslar pahalı olduğu için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 40. Sınıf içinde, herkesin ortasında, bana sorulacak soruları cevaplamak istemezdim. ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 41. Kursta başarısız olmaktan korktuğum için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 42. Sıkılacağımı düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 43. Kurslarda yer bulamadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 44. Çalıştığım iş yerinde yerime bakacak kimse olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 45. Ailemle ilgilenmem gerektiği için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 46. Kurslara benim kadar yaşlı insanlar pek gitmediği için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 47. Kursların zor olduğunu düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 48. Kurslara katıldığımda çevremdekilerin bana güleceğini düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 49. Tembel biri olduğumu düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 50. Kursları düzenleyen kuruluşlar hakkında bilgim olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 51. Kursa gidersem benim cahil olduğumu düşünürler. ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 52. Ulaşım masrafları çok tuttuğu için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 53. Kurslara katılmanın benim gelirimin artmasına faydası olacağına inanmadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 54. Kursları bitirmek uzun sürdüğü için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 55. Evdeki işlerden zaman bulamadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 56. İstediğim konuda kurs açılmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 57. Kursa gitmeme kaynanam izin vermediği için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

| Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri | Hiç doğru değil | Biraz doğru | Oldukça doğru | Çok doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58. İş yerimden izin alamadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 59. Hangi konuda kursa gitmek istediğime karar veremediğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 60. Maddi gücüm yetersiz olduğu için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 61. Çalıştığım iş yerinde işler çok yoğun olduğu için ... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 62. Sağlığım bozuk olduğu için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 63. Öğrendiklerimi çok çabuk unuttuğum için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 64. Okuma yazmam zayıf olduğu için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 65. Açılan kurslardan haberim olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 66. Bir eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılma ihtiyacı duymadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 67. Yeni şeyler öğrenmek zor geldiği için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 68. Yabancı bir ortama girmekten çekindiğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 69. Böyle şeylere ayıracak zamanım olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 70. Böyle şeyler para kazandırmaz. ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 71. Kurs öğretmeni karşı cinsten olabileceği için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 72. Yeniden öğrenci olmak istemediğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 73. Kurs saatleri uzun sürdüğü için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 74. Ulaşım zor olduğu için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

# Appendix E

The criterion for the eligibility of the nonparticipants as a subject used during the data collection

1. Adults who will be administered the instrument shouldn't be students by now in any formal educational institution and should be the ones who have never participated in the following educational activities since the age of 14:

   . In a course offered by the People's Education Centers
   . In a course or any educational activity offered by any adult education institution bound to the Ministry of National Education. . In any privat course (Computer, accounting, foreign language, etc).
   . In an in-service training program offered by the work place.
   . In any course offered by a foundation, municipality or association.

2. The instrument can be administered to the adults who have participated in the following educational activities.

   . In university preparatory courses.
   . In the courses where pregnant women attend.
   . In short-term seminars.
   . In driver courses.
   . In stoker courses. (these courses are offered by the People's Education Centers)
   . In the Natural gas courses. (these courses are offered by the People's Education Centers)

# Appendix F

Item-Total Statistics of 74 items

| | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 119.7742 | 732.2330 | .2063 | .5477 | .9323 |
| 2 | 120.6559 | 743.1186 | .0342 | .4883 | .9330 |
| 3 | 119.9857 | 724.6976 | .3142 | .6854 | .9316 |
| 4 | 120.9319 | 729.7471 | .3659 | .4244 | .9311 |
| 5 | 120.7491 | 735.7570 | .1935 | .6047 | .9320 |
| 6 | 120.7849 | 736.7953 | .1499 | .5330 | .9324 |
| 7 | 121.1004 | 735.6733 | .2933 | .6563 | .9315 |
| 8 | 121.1039 | 733.0647 | .3743 | .5089 | .9312 |
| 9 | 121.0717 | 733.1028 | .3964 | .6940 | .9311 |
| 10 | 121.0430 | 732.1204 | .3974 | .7214 | .9311 |
| 11 | 120.7097 | 732.6744 | .2485 | .6494 | .9318 |
| 12 | 120.7849 | 731.5867 | .2545 | .5410 | .9318 |
| 13 | 120.2115 | 734.4695 | .1821 | .4099 | .9323 |
| 14 | 120.5914 | 736.1634 | .1774 | .4592 | .9322 |
| 15 | 120.9140 | 732.6976 | .3195 | .6642 | .9314 |
| 16 | 120.7921 | 731.8559 | .3036 | .4693 | .9314 |
| 17 | 120.8781 | 735.3880 | .2145 | .5709 | .9319 |
| 18 | 120.3441 | 728.5646 | .2849 | .6154 | .9317 |
| 19 | 120.2616 | 718.0140 | .5170 | .6307 | .9303 |
| 20 | 120.7849 | 722.7018 | .4816 | .6338 | .9305 |
| 21 | 120.6738 | 725.1774 | .4156 | .6027 | .9309 |
| 22 | 120.8530 | 730.8308 | .3471 | .6685 | .9312 |
| 23 | 120.2581 | 717.4440 | .4883 | .5822 | .9304 |
| 24 | 120.8244 | 722.4834 | .5075 | .5887 | .9304 |
| 25 | 121.0000 | 729.7914 | .3961 | .6429 | .9310 |
| 26 | 120.7849 | 721.0615 | .4974 | .6305 | .9304 |
| 27 | 120.3226 | 724.0395 | .3676 | .5702 | .9312 |
| 28 | 120.9857 | 730.5538 | .3515 | .6442 | .9312 |
| 29 | 120.2652 | 718.7711 | .4225 | .6605 | .9308 |
| 30 | 120.3369 | 724.6559 | .3501 | .5829 | .9313 |
| 31 | 120.8495 | 721.7255 | .5113 | .6958 | .9304 |
| 32 | 119.8136 | 722.4975 | .3663 | .7104 | .9312 |
| 33 | 120.7778 | 726.9792 | .4198 | .5271 | .9309 |
| 34 | 120.7778 | 724.6986 | .4425 | .5411 | .9307 |
| 35 | 120.6667 | 715.9640 | .6083 | .6959 | .9298 |
| 36 | 120.8674 | 726.3672 | .3822 | .5168 | .9310 |
| 37 | 120.5663 | 720.6709 | .4098 | .7089 | .9309 |
| 38 | 119.9964 | 716.4065 | .4135 | .7714 | .9310 |
| 39 | 119.8244 | 718.3036 | .4097 | .6998 | .9310 |
| 40 | 120.9391 | 725.7481 | .4919 | .6099 | .9306 |
| 41 | 120.9749 | 725.8087 | .5065 | .7004 | .9306 |
| 42 | 120.8674 | 725.8349 | .4802 | .6149 | .9306 |
| 43 | 121.1649 | 736.6706 | .3353 | .5391 | .9314 |
| 44 | 120.1864 | 724.4256 | .2953 | .6916 | .9319 |
| 45 | 120.1864 | 720.5263 | .4044 | .6151 | .9310 |
| 46 | 120.9391 | 724.7409 | .4939 | .6976 | .9306 |
| 47 | 120.9749 | 723.5497 | .5984 | .7409 | .9302 |
| 48 | 121.1613 | 730.3444 | .5503 | .7648 | .9307 |
| 49 | 121.0717 | 737.5200 | .2471 | .5228 | .9317 |
| 50 | 120.4014 | 716.1188 | .5273 | .6205 | .9302 |
| 51 | 121.1685 | 729.6442 | .5234 | .7163 | .9307 |

| | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 52 | 120.2760 | 712.0207 | .5435 | .7727 | .9300 |
| 53 | 120.6201 | 715.5674 | .5369 | .6155 | .9301 |
| 54 | 120.5018 | 720.3660 | .4854 | .5479 | .9305 |
| 55 | 120.3369 | 718.5839 | .4376 | .6197 | .9307 |
| 56 | 120.7061 | 725.7191 | .3849 | .5853 | .9310 |
| 57 | 121.1290 | 732.9833 | .3491 | .5686 | .9313 |
| 58 | 120.4946 | 725.5099 | .3218 | .6323 | .9315 |
| 59 | 120.7491 | 728.9800 | .3546 | .4786 | .9312 |
| 60 | 120.1470 | 720.2625 | .3868 | .8320 | .9311 |
| 61 | 120.0681 | 723.4594 | .3088 | .7449 | .9318 |
| 62 | 120.9892 | 731.3416 | .3653 | .5140 | .9312 |
| 63 | 120.8996 | 721.5582 | .5791 | .6632 | .9302 |
| 64 | 121.0394 | 729.1243 | .4412 | .6313 | .9309 |
| 65 | 120.3262 | 717.6234 | .4750 | .6481 | .9305 |
| 66 | 120.8602 | 729.0128 | .3795 | .6250 | .9311 |
| 67 | 120.9857 | 726.9494 | .5014 | .7111 | .9306 |
| 68 | 121.0251 | 727.4274 | .5147 | .6999 | .9306 |
| 69 | 120.1362 | 721.7799 | .3769 | .5510 | .9311 |
| 70 | 120.8602 | 725.7394 | .4292 | .5719 | .9308 |
| 71 | 121.1685 | 734.4212 | .3680 | .5420 | .9313 |
| 72 | 120.9247 | 729.9260 | .3682 | .5113 | .9311 |
| 73 | 120.4444 | 717.7946 | .5315 | .6154 | .9302 |
| 74 | 120.1219 | 714.9563 | .4877 | .7286 | .9304 |

Cronbach Alpha= .9319

# Appendix G

Item-Total Statistics of 70 items

| | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 112.6406 | 699.5668 | .1909 | .5189 | .9343 |
| 3 | 112.8541 | 689.8393 | .3392 | .6752 | .9334 |
| 4 | 113.7900 | 696.7808 | .3514 | .4141 | .9331 |
| 6 | 113.6441 | 702.4443 | .1632 | .5175 | .9343 |
| 7 | 113.9644 | 701.9059 | .2991 | .6538 | .9334 |
| 8 | 113.9573 | 699.9696 | .3542 | .4992 | .9332 |
| 9 | 113.9324 | 699.9276 | .3838 | .6807 | .9331 |
| 10 | 113.9075 | 698.7557 | .3934 | .7085 | .9330 |
| 11 | 113.5658 | 701.1965 | .2047 | .5400 | .9340 |
| 12 | 113.6477 | 697.9790 | .2567 | .5196 | .9337 |
| 15 | 113.7794 | 700.3869 | .2876 | .6210 | .9334 |
| 16 | 113.6477 | 698.6004 | .2924 | .4812 | .9334 |
| 17 | 113.7438 | 702.3913 | .2009 | .5209 | .9339 |
| 18 | 113.2028 | 695.8051 | .2705 | .6053 | .9337 |
| 19 | 113.1317 | 684.9290 | .5141 | .6029 | .9322 |
| 20 | 113.6512 | 689.0422 | .4904 | .6224 | .9324 |
| 21 | 113.5338 | 692.7926 | .3932 | .5906 | .9329 |
| 22 | 113.7117 | 698.4345 | .3177 | .6629 | .9333 |
| 23 | 113.1174 | 683.9612 | .4911 | .5752 | .9323 |
| 24 | 113.6868 | 689.0516 | .5116 | .5794 | .9323 |
| 25 | 113.8648 | 696.2031 | .4002 | .6298 | .9329 |
| 26 | 113.6477 | 688.5719 | .4815 | .5996 | .9324 |
| 27 | 113.1851 | 690.8299 | .3649 | .5621 | .9331 |
| 28 | 113.8505 | 696.6347 | .3631 | .6287 | .9331 |
| 29 | 113.1352 | 685.9531 | .4155 | .6597 | .9328 |
| 30 | 113.1957 | 692.1366 | .3352 | .5769 | .9333 |
| 31 | 113.7153 | 687.9687 | .5232 | .6842 | .9322 |
| 32 | 112.6797 | 689.3256 | .3637 | .7024 | .9332 |
| 33 | 113.6335 | 693.8259 | .4073 | .5055 | .9329 |
| 34 | 113.6370 | 691.2178 | .4440 | .5274 | .9327 |
| 35 | 113.5338 | 682.6926 | .6118 | .6909 | .9317 |
| 36 | 113.7331 | 693.1321 | .3796 | .4989 | .9330 |
| 37 | 113.4342 | 686.4894 | .4268 | .7037 | .9327 |
| 38 | 112.8683 | 681.5290 | .4397 | .7648 | .9327 |
| 39 | 112.6975 | 683.6117 | .4327 | .6940 | .9328 |
| 40 | 113.8043 | 692.2080 | .4974 | .6079 | .9325 |
| 41 | 113.8399 | 692.2778 | .5119 | .6924 | .9324 |
| 42 | 113.7295 | 692.8337 | .4711 | .5934 | .9326 |
| 43 | 114.0249 | 703.2029 | .3280 | .5204 | .9333 |
| 44 | 113.0534 | 691.5007 | .2890 | .6860 | .9339 |
| 45 | 113.0534 | 687.1793 | .4064 | .6037 | .9329 |
| 46 | 113.8043 | 691.1223 | .5017 | .6859 | .9324 |
| 47 | 113.8399 | 689.8635 | .6102 | .7357 | .9321 |
| 48 | 114.0249 | 696.6529 | .5598 | .7602 | .9326 |
| 49 | 113.9359 | 703.9745 | .2443 | .5142 | .9336 |
| 50 | 113.2633 | 683.0161 | .5260 | .6157 | .9321 |
| 51 | 114.0320 | 695.9240 | .5337 | .7135 | .9326 |
| 52 | 113.1459 | 677.7108 | .5655 | .7700 | .9318 |
| 53 | 113.4875 | 682.4650 | .5370 | .6081 | .9320 |
| 54 | 113.3594 | 687.0168 | .4874 | .5390 | .9324 |
| 55 | 113.2028 | 684.4408 | .4548 | .6125 | .9326 |

| | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 56 | 113.5623 | 692.5970 | .3755 | .5650 | .9330 |
| 57 | 113.9929 | 699.3714 | .3520 | .5569 | .9332 |
| 58 | 113.3630 | 691.9035 | .3261 | .6196 | .9334 |
| 59 | 113.6157 | 695.6875 | .3514 | .4638 | .9331 |
| 60 | 113.0178 | 685.2033 | .4167 | .8282 | .9329 |
| 61 | 112.9359 | 690.7530 | .2993 | .7368 | .9338 |
| 62 | 113.8541 | 697.8893 | .3647 | .5019 | .9331 |
| 63 | 113.7651 | 687.9804 | .5880 | .6549 | .9320 |
| 64 | 113.9039 | 695.2800 | .4534 | .6257 | .9327 |
| 65 | 113.1851 | 684.5442 | .4737 | .6389 | .9324 |
| 66 | 113.7224 | 696.3227 | .3614 | .6005 | .9331 |
| 67 | 113.8505 | 693.2347 | .5114 | .7057 | .9325 |
| 68 | 113.8897 | 693.7271 | .5246 | .6902 | .9325 |
| 69 | 113.0071 | 688.4214 | .3776 | .5472 | .9331 |
| 70 | 113.7260 | 692.4354 | .4283 | .5678 | .9327 |
| 71 | 114.0320 | 700.7240 | .3732 | .5366 | .9332 |
| 72 | 113.7900 | 696.7022 | .3626 | .5030 | .9331 |
| 73 | 113.3025 | 684.6189 | .5314 | .6094 | .9321 |
| 74 | 112.9929 | 680.8357 | .5044 | .7241 | .9322 |

Cronbach Alpha= .9338

# Appendix H

Item-Total Statistics of 67 items

| | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 108.1708 | 654.9421 | .1924 | .5108 | .9329 |
| 3 | 108.3843 | 645.6875 | .3379 | .6696 | .9319 |
| 4 | 109.3203 | 652.3328 | .3518 | .4078 | .9316 |
| 6 | 109.1744 | 657.6445 | .1667 | .5105 | .9328 |
| 7 | 109.4947 | 657.0366 | .3081 | .6509 | .9318 |
| 8 | 109.4875 | 655.4507 | .3539 | .4948 | .9317 |
| 9 | 109.4626 | 655.4138 | .3834 | .6750 | .9316 |
| 10 | 109.4377 | 654.1756 | .3964 | .7008 | .9315 |
| 11 | 109.0961 | 656.7514 | .2017 | .5370 | .9325 |
| 15 | 109.3096 | 655.9359 | .2850 | .6150 | .9319 |
| 16 | 109.1779 | 654.0539 | .2938 | .4619 | .9319 |
| 17 | 109.2740 | 657.6496 | .2039 | .4969 | .9324 |
| 18 | 108.7331 | 651.2107 | .2739 | .5956 | .9322 |
| 19 | 108.6619 | 641.0532 | .5104 | .5736 | .9307 |
| 20 | 109.1815 | 644.7848 | .4922 | .6124 | .9308 |
| 21 | 109.0641 | 648.6816 | .3888 | .5691 | .9314 |
| 22 | 109.2420 | 653.8698 | .3198 | .6446 | .9318 |
| 23 | 108.6477 | 639.8576 | .4927 | .5715 | .9307 |
| 24 | 109.2171 | 644.9206 | .5104 | .5784 | .9308 |
| 25 | 109.3950 | 651.9184 | .3968 | .6284 | .9314 |
| 26 | 109.1779 | 644.6325 | .4763 | .5878 | .9309 |
| 27 | 108.7153 | 646.5044 | .3664 | .5563 | .9316 |
| 28 | 109.3808 | 652.0295 | .3677 | .6254 | .9315 |
| 29 | 108.6655 | 642.3663 | .4065 | .6410 | .9314 |
| 30 | 108.7260 | 647.7639 | .3367 | .5621 | .9318 |
| 31 | 109.2456 | 643.7645 | .5246 | .6659 | .9307 |
| 32 | 108.2100 | 645.2022 | .3622 | .6774 | .9317 |
| 33 | 109.1637 | 649.7874 | .4000 | .5023 | .9314 |
| 34 | 109.1673 | 646.9969 | .4433 | .5176 | .9311 |
| 35 | 109.0641 | 638.7602 | .6110 | .6867 | .9301 |
| 36 | 109.2633 | 649.2590 | .3698 | .4727 | .9315 |
| 37 | 108.9644 | 642.5344 | .4239 | .6927 | .9312 |
| 38 | 108.3986 | 637.5334 | .4403 | .7629 | .9312 |
| 39 | 108.2278 | 639.6051 | .4325 | .6862 | .9312 |
| 40 | 109.3345 | 647.9163 | .4977 | .6023 | .9309 |
| 41 | 109.3701 | 647.9125 | .5143 | .6855 | .9309 |
| 42 | 109.2598 | 648.4644 | .4730 | .5864 | .9310 |
| 43 | 109.5552 | 658.5978 | .3271 | .5133 | .9318 |
| 44 | 108.5836 | 647.4082 | .2858 | .6795 | .9324 |
| 45 | 108.5836 | 642.5653 | .4151 | .5963 | .9313 |
| 46 | 109.3345 | 646.9091 | .5009 | .6773 | .9309 |
| 47 | 109.3701 | 645.5911 | .6124 | .7341 | .9305 |
| 48 | 109.5552 | 652.1621 | .5628 | .7539 | .9310 |
| 49 | 109.4662 | 659.3569 | .2430 | .5099 | .9321 |
| 50 | 108.7936 | 639.1430 | .5237 | .6006 | .9305 |
| 51 | 109.5623 | 651.6041 | .5311 | .6958 | .9310 |
| 52 | 108.6762 | 633.8912 | .5655 | .7680 | .9302 |
| 53 | 109.0178 | 638.6175 | .5345 | .6059 | .9305 |
| 54 | 108.8897 | 642.9056 | .4873 | .5353 | .9308 |
| 55 | 108.7331 | 640.0107 | .4619 | .6066 | .9310 |
| 56 | 109.0925 | 648.4200 | .3728 | .5601 | .9315 |

| | Scale mean if item deleted | Scale variance if item deleted | Corrected item-total correlation | Squared multiple correlation | Alpha if item deleted |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 57 | 109.5231 | 654.8075 | .3537 | .5458 | .9316 |
| 58 | 108.8932 | 648.1243 | .3168 | .5710 | .9320 |
| 60 | 108.5480 | 641.0986 | .4172 | .8265 | .9313 |
| 61 | 108.4662 | 646.5640 | .2981 | .7268 | .9323 |
| 62 | 109.3843 | 653.4518 | .3640 | .4996 | .9316 |
| 63 | 109.2954 | 643.8374 | .5881 | .6537 | .9304 |
| 64 | 109.4342 | 650.8537 | .4548 | .6110 | .9312 |
| 65 | 108.7153 | 640.5758 | .4722 | .6357 | .9309 |
| 66 | 109.2527 | 651.9324 | .3607 | .5911 | .9316 |
| 67 | 109.3808 | 648.9938 | .5094 | .6904 | .9309 |
| 68 | 109.4199 | 649.3945 | .5249 | .6850 | .9309 |
| 69 | 108.5374 | 644.1423 | .3795 | .5449 | .9316 |
| 70 | 109.2562 | 648.3841 | .4226 | .5613 | .9312 |
| 71 | 109.5623 | 656.2256 | .3713 | .5292 | .9316 |
| 73 | 108.8327 | 640.4755 | .5336 | .6053 | .9305 |
| 74 | 108.5231 | 636.7718 | .5069 | .7176 | .9306 |

Cronbach Alpha= .9323

# Appendix I

Rotated Factor Matrix of 15 Factors

| It. No. | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | ,58569 | | |
| 3 | ,79852 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | ,33456 | |
| 7 | | | | ,67151 | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | ,60785 | | | |
| 12 | ,39679 | | ,37470 | | |
| 15 | | ,49450 | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | ,64556 | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | ,55649 | | | |
| 22 | | ,70535 | | | |
| 23 | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | ,68222 |
| 26 | | ,62103 | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | ,69638 | |
| 29 | | | ,77185 | | |
| 30 | | | ,54863 | | |
| 31 | | | | | |
| 32 | | | ,66114 | | |
| 33 | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | |
| 35 | | ,35518 | | | |
| 36 | | | ,41493 | | |
| 37 | ,70782 | | | | |
| 38 | ,81579 | | | | |
| 39 | ,81175 | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | |
| 42 | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | ,51253 | |
| 44 | | | ,80083 | | |
| 45 | | | | | |
| 46 | | | | | ,65847 |
| 47 | | | | | ,32515 |
| 48 | | | | ,47345 | ,42580 |
| 49 | | | | ,31160 | |
| 50 | | | | | |
| 51 | | | | ,32125 | ,46641 |
| 52 | ,76652 | | | | |
| 53 | | ,54046 | | | |
| 54 | | | | | |
| 55 | | | | | |
| 56 | | ,44673 | | | |
| 57 | | | | ,71273 | |

| It. No. | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58 | ,31775 | | ,60802 | | |
| 59 | | | | | ,31596 |
| 60 | ,87518 | | | | |
| 61 | | | ,82456 | | |
| 62 | | | | | ,63610 |
| 63 | | | | | |
| 64 | | | | | |
| 65 | | | | | |
| 66 | | ,47961 | | | ,45489 |
| 67 | | | | | ,45448 |
| 68 | | | | ,32858 | |
| 69 | | | ,58463 | | |
| 70 | | ,55874 | | | |
| 71 | | | | ,63152 | |
| 72 | | | | ,31744 | ,39951 |
| 73 | | | | | |
| 74 | ,59764 | | | | |

| It. No. | Factor 6 | Factor 7 | Factor 8 | Factor 9 | Factor 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | ,61222 | | |
| 7 | | | ,33177 | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | ,68552 |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | ,74218 | | |
| 19 | ,59200 | | | | |
| 20 | | ,37751 | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | ,38236 | | | | |
| 24 | ,35213 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | ,76145 | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | |
| 30 | | | ,34798 | | |
| 31 | | ,59554 | | | |
| 32 | | | ,35725 | | |
| 33 | | | | | ,55091 |
| 34 | | | | ,40548 | |
| 35 | ,48801 | | | | |

| It. No. | Factor 6 | Factor 7 | Factor 8 | Factor 9 | Factor 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 36 | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | ,65501 | |
| 41 | | ,50342 | | ,63812 | |
| 42 | | | | ,67263 | |
| 43 | | ,31717 | | | |
| 44 | | | | | |
| 45 | | | ,76659 | | |
| 46 | | ,31656 | | | |
| 47 | | | | ,42159 | |
| 48 | | ,32527 | | ,31052 | |
| 49 | | ,63153 | | | |
| 50 | ,68070 | | | | |
| 51 | | ,37040 | | | |
| 52 | | | | | |
| 53 | | | | | |
| 54 | | | | | |
| 55 | | | ,64590 | | |
| 56 | | | | | ,40019 |
| 57 | | | | | |
| 58 | | | | | |
| 59 | ,30611 | | | | |
| 60 | | | | | |
| 61 | | | | | |
| 62 | | | | | |
| 63 | | ,56118 | | | |
| 64 | | ,62915 | | | |
| 65 | ,79701 | | | | |
| 66 | | | | | |
| 67 | | ,40985 | | ,34618 | |
| 68 | | ,30197 | | ,46943 | |
| 69 | | | ,36627 | | |
| 70 | | | | | |
| 71 | | | | | |
| 72 | | | | ,35745 | |
| 73 | | | | | |
| 74 | | | | | |

| It. No. | Factor 11 | Factor 12 | Factor 13 | Factor 14 | Factor 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | ,65683 | |
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | ,68795 | |
| 9 | ,60686 | | | | |
| 10 | ,70685 | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | | -,31714 | | | |

| It. No. | Factor 11 | Factor 12 | Factor 13 | Factor 14 | Factor 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | ,38089 | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | |
| 19 | | | ,43269 | | |
| 20 | | | ,44953 | | |
| 21 | | | | | ,41601 |
| 22 | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | ,56302 |
| 24 | | | ,51633 | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | |
| 34 | | | ,34756 | | |
| 35 | | | ,38738 | | |
| 36 | | | ,39183 | | |
| 37 | | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | |
| 42 | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | |
| 45 | | | | | |
| 46 | | | | | |
| 47 | | ,35194 | | | |
| 48 | | | | | |
| 49 | | | | | |
| 50 | | | | | |
| 51 | | | | | |
| 52 | | | | | |
| 53 | | | | | |
| 54 | | ,58691 | | | |
| 55 | | | | | |
| 56 | | | | | |
| 57 | | | | | |
| 58 | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | -,33472 | |
| 60 | | | | | |
| 61 | | | | | |
| 62 | | | | | |
| 63 | | | | | |
| 64 | | | | | |
| 65 | | | | | |
| 66 | | | | | |
| 67 | | | | | |

| It. No. | Factor 11 | Factor 12 | Factor 13 | Factor 14 | Factor 15 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 68 | | | | | |
| 69 | | | | | |
| 70 | | | | | -,31725 |
| 71 | | | | | |
| 72 | | | | | |
| 73 | | ,58307 | | | |
| 74 | | ,32326 | | | |

# Appendix J

15 Factors and the items included in each factor with the item numbers, factor loadings and factor numbers given by the judges during the content validity stage according to the definitions of 4 factors; situational (1), institutional (2), informational (3) and psychosocial (4)

| FACTOR 1 | FACTOR LOADING | JUDGES |
|---|---|---|
| 60. Maddi gücüm yetersiz olduğu için ..... | .87518 | 1 |
| 38. Geçim sıkıntısı daha ağır bastığı için .. | .81579 | 1 |
| 39. Kurslar pahalı olduğu için ..... | .81175 | 1 |
| 3. Kurs için gerekli olan harcamaları karşılayamayacağımı düşündüğüm için ..... | .79852 | 1 |
| 52. Ulaşım masrafları çok tuttuğu için ..... | .76652 | 1 |
| 37. Ailem parasal destekte bulunmadığı için . | .70782 | 1 |
| 74. Ulaşım zor olduğu için ..... | .59764 | 1 |
| FACTOR 2 | | |
| 22. Kursların bana bir imkan sağlayacağına inanmadığım için ..... | .70535 | 4 |
| 17. Eğitimin bana işimde/mesleğimde yardımcı olacağına inanmadığım için ..... | .64556 | 4 |
| 26. Bir kursu bitirmemin iş bulmama yardımı olacağına inanmadığım için ..... | .62103 | 4 |
| 11. Kurslara katılmaya ilgi duymadığım için . | .60785 | 4 |
| 70. Böyle şeyler para kazandırmaz. ..... | .55874 | 4 |
| 21. İlgi duyduğum konularda kurs bulamadığım için ..... | .55649 | 2 |
| 53. Kurslara katılmanın benim gelirimin artmasına faydası olacağına inanmadığım için ..... | .54046 | 4 |
| 15. Kurslara katılmayı gereksiz bulduğum için ..... | .49450 | 4 |
| 66. Bir eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılma ihtiyacı duymadığım için ..... | .47961 | 4 |
| 56. İstediğim konuda kurs açılmadığı için ... | .44673 | 2 |
| FACTOR 3 | | |
| 61. Çalıştığım iş yerinde işler çok yoğun olduğu için ..... | .82456 | 1 |
| 44. Çalıştığım iş yerinde yerime bakacak kimse olmadığı için ..... | .80083 | 1 |
| 29. İş yerinde çok yorulduğum için ..... | .77185 | 1 |
| 32. Kurslara düzenli bir şekilde katılabilecek kadar zamanım olmadığı için ..... | .66114 | 1 |
| 58. İş yerimden izin alamadığım için ..... | .60802 | 1 |
| 1. Kursa katılacak zamanım olmadığı için ... | .58569 | 1 |
| 69. Böyle şeylere ayıracak zamanım olmadığı için ..... | .58463 | 4 |
| 30. Zaten çok az olan boş zamanımı harcamak istemediğim için ..... | .54863 | 4 |
| 36. Ek bir işte çalıştığım için zamanım yok ..... | .41493 | 1 |
| FACTOR 4 | | |
| 57. Kursa gitmeme kaynanam izin vermediği için ..... | .71273 | 1 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 28. Ailem izin vermediği için ..... | .69638 | 1 |
| 7. Kursa gitmeme eşim izin vermediği için ..... | .67151 | 1 |
| 71. Kurs öğretmeni karşı cinsten olabileceği için ..... | .63152 | 4 |
| 43. Kurslarda yer bulamadığım için ..... | .51253 | 2 |
| 48. Kurslara katıldığımda çevremdekilerin bana güleceğini düşündüğüm için ..... | .47345 | 4 |
| FACTOR 5 | | |
| 25. Yaşlı olduğum için ..... | .68222 | 4 |
| 46. Kurslara benim kadar yaşlı insanlar pek gitmediği için ..... | .65847 | 4 |
| 62. Sağlığım bozuk olduğu için ..... | .63610 | 1 |
| 51. Kursa gidersem benim cahil olduğumu düşünürler. ..... | .46641 | 4 |
| 66. Bir eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılma ihtiyacı duymadığım için ..... | .45489 | 4 |
| 67. Yeni şeyler öğrenmek zor geldiği için ..... | .45448 | 4 |
| 48. Kurslara katıldığımda çevremdekilerin bana güleceğini düşündüğüm için ..... | .42580 | 4 |
| FACTOR 6 | | |
| 65. Açılan kurslardan haberim olmadığı için ..... | .79701 | 3 |
| 27. Çevremde açılan kurslarla ilgili duyurulara hiç rastlamadığım için ..... | .76145 | 3 |
| 50. Kursları düzenleyen kuruluşlar hakkında bilgim olmadığı için ..... | .68070 | 3 |
| 19. Mevcut yetişkin eğitimi kursları hakkında bilgim olmadığı için ..... | .59200 | 3 |
| 35. Bu kurslarda neler yapıldığını bilmediğim için ..... | .48801 | 3 |
| FACTOR 7 | | |
| 49. Tembel biri olduğumu düşündüğüm için ..... | .63153 | 4 |
| 64. Okuma yazmam zayıf olduğu için ..... | .62915 | 4 |
| 31. Benim öğrenim düzeyim çok düşük olduğu için ..... | .59554 | 4 |
| 63. öğrendiklerimi çok çabuk unuttuğum için ..... | .56118 | 4 |
| 41. Kursta başarısız olmaktan korktuğum için ..... | .50342 | 4 |
| 67. Yeni şeyler öğrenmek zor geldiği için ... | .40985 | 4 |
| FACTOR 8 | | |
| 45. Ailemle ilgilenmem gerektiği için ..... | .76659 | 1 |
| 18. Zamanımın çoğunu ailemle birlikte geçirmek istediğim için ..... | .74218 | 1 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 55. Evdeki işlerden zaman bulamadığım için ..... | .64590 | 1 |
| 6. Çocuklarımı bırakacak yer bulamadığım için ..... | .61222 | 1 |
| FACTOR 9 | | |
| 42. Sıkılacağımı düşündüğüm için ..... | .67263 | 4 |
| 40. Sınıf içinde, herkesin ortasında, bana sorulacak soruları cevaplamak istemezdim. ..... | .65501 | 4 |
| 41. Kursta başarısız olmaktan korktuğum için ..... | .63812 | 4 |
| 68. Yabancı bir ortama girmekten çekindiğim için ..... | .46943 | 4 |
| 47. Kursların zor olduğunu düşündüğüm için ..... | .42159 | 4 |
| 34. Kursa birlikte gidecek insan bulamadığım için ..... | .40548 | 1 |
| FACTOR 10 | | |
| 16. Mevcut kursları düzenleyen kurumların nitelikli olduğuna inanmadığım için ..... | .68552 | 4 |
| 33. Kurslar ihtiyaçlarımıza cevap verebilecek düzeyde olmadığı için ..... | .55091 | 2 |
| 56. İstediğim konuda kurs açılmadığı için ... | .40019 | 2 |
| FACTOR 11 | | |
| 10. Verilen dersleri kafamın almayacağını düşündüğüm için ..... | .70685 | 4 |
| 9. Öğrenme yeteneğime güvenemediğim için ..... | .60686 | 4 |
| FACTOR 12 | | |
| 54. Kursları bitirmek uzun sürdüğü için ..... | .58691 | 2 |
| 73. Kurs saatleri uzun sürdüğü için ..... | .58307 | 2 |
| FACTOR 13 | | |
| 24. Bu kurslara ne tür insanların gittiklerini bilmediğim için ..... | .51633 | 3 |
| 20. Genç öğrencilerle rekabet edemeyeceğimi düşündüğüm için ..... | .44953 | 4 |
| 19. Mevcut yetişkin eğitimi kursları hakkında bilgim olmadığı için ..... | .43269 | 3 |
| FACTOR 14 | | |
| 8. Kurs öğretmenlerinin kursiyerlere iyi davranmadığını duymuştum..... | .68795 | 2 |
| 4. Bu kurslardaki öğretmenleri pek fazla tanımadığım için ..... | .65683 | 3 |

| FACTOR 15 | | |
|---|---|---|
| 23. Rahatça gidebileceğim bir yerde kurs olmadığı için ..... | .56302 | 2 |
| 21. İlgi duyduğum konularda kurs bulamadığım için ..... | .41601 | 2 |

# Appendix K

The distribution of the items according to the judges' classification and four factor solution of the factor analysis, with their factor loadings

| | Factor 1 | | Factor 2 | | Factor 3 | | Factor 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| It. No. | Loading | Judge | Loading | Judge | Loading | Judge | Loading | Judge |
| 1 | | | | | | | .62629 | 1 |
| 3 | | | | | .71134 | 1 | | |
| 4 | .38288 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | .60902 | 1 | | | | |
| 7 | | | .63307 | 1 | | | | |
| 8 | .33602 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 9 | .47243 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 10 | .38842 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 11 | .49357 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | | | .43928 | 1 | | |
| 15 | .57357 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 16 | .39642 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 17 | .56744 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | .48650 | 1 | | | | |
| 19 | .48007 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 20 | .46276 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 21 | .54303 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 22 | .60681 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | .34668 | 2 | | |
| 24 | .53156 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 25 | .48662 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 26 | .63172 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 27 | .38928 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | .57581 | 1 | | | | |
| 29 | | | | | | | .70004 | 1 |
| 30 | | | | | | | .61658 | 4 |
| 31 | .38780 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | | | .77478 | 1 |
| 33 | .53294 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | .37974 | 1 | | | | |
| 35 | .56008 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | | | .31734 | 1 |
| 37 | | | | | .66345 | 1 | | |
| 38 | | | | | .79541 | 1 | | |
| 39 | | | | | .77999 | 1 | | |
| 40 | | | .45237 | 4 | | | | |
| 41 | .49686 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 42 | .40829 | 4 | .44808 | 4 | | | | |
| 43 | .42720 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | | | .68351 | 1 |
| 45 | | | .58227 | 1 | | | | |
| 46 | .54282 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 47 | | | .55462 | 4 | | | | |
| 48 | .47078 | 4 | .56843 | 4 | | | | |
| 49 | .39588 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 50 | .47188 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 51 | .47836 | 4 | .41092 | 4 | | | | |
| 52 | | | | | .77498 | 1 | | |
| 53 | .53025 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 54 | | | | | .30006 | 2 | | |

| | Factor 1 | | Factor 2 | | Factor 3 | | Factor 4 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| It. No. | Loading | Judge | Loading | Judge | Loading | Judge | Loading | Judge |
| 55 | | | .64399 | 1 | | | | |
| 56 | .58024 | 2 | | | | | | |
| 57 | | | .58278 | 1 | | | | |
| 58 | | | | | | | .49711 | 1 |
| 59 | .43724 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 60 | | | | | .84659 | 1 | | |
| 61 | | | | | | | .70602 | 1 |
| 62 | .36517 | 1 | | | | | | |
| 63 | .42349 | 4 | .40752 | 4 | | | | |
| 64 | .33696 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 65 | .45508 | 3 | | | | | | |
| 66 | .49423 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 67 | .45328 | 4 | .55212 | 4 | | | | |
| 68 | .40051 | 4 | .50188 | 4 | | | | |
| 69 | | | | | | | .64025 | 4 |
| 70 | .56238 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 71 | | | .44507 | 4 | | | | |
| 72 | .45939 | 4 | | | | | | |
| 73 | | | .36842 | 2 | | | | |
| 74 | | | | | .67401 | 1 | | |

# Appendix L

The items with their mean scores, standard deviations, variances and factor numbers ranked in descending order according to their mean scores

| It. No. | | Mean | SD | Var. | Fac. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Kursa katılacak zamanım olmadığı için | 2.52 | 1.10 | 1.21 | F3 |
| 39. | Kurslar pahalı olduğu için | 2.50 | 1.18 | 1.38 | F1 |
| 32. | Kurslara düzenli bir şekilde katılabilecek kadar zamanım olmadığı için | 2.46 | 1.11 | 1.23 | F3 |
| 3. | Kurs için gerekli olan harcamaları karşılayamayacağımı düşündüğüm için | 2.34 | 1.17 | 1.37 | F1 |
| 38. | Geçim sıkıntısı daha ağır bastığı için | 2.33 | 1.24 | 1.54 | F1 |
| 61. | Çalıştığım iş yerinde işler çok yoğun olduğu için | 2.23 | 1.24 | 1.53 | F3 |
| 74. | Ulaşım zor olduğu için | 2.20 | 1.14 | 1.29 | F1 |
| 60. | Maddi gücüm yetersiz olduğu için | 2.19 | 1.16 | 1.35 | F1 |
| 69. | Böyle şeylere ayıracak zamanım olmadığı için | 2.14 | 1.09 | 1.20 | F3 |
| 44. | Çalıştığım iş yerinde yerime bakacak kimse olmadığı için | 2.12 | 1.24 | 1.55 | F3 |
| 45. | Ailemle ilgilenmem gerektiği için | 2.12 | 1.10 | 1.22 | F7 |
| 23. | Rahatça gidebileceğim bir yerde kurs olmadığı için | 2.08 | 1.06 | 1.12 | F8 |
| 29. | İş yerinde çok yorulduğum için | 2.05 | 1.15 | 1.33 | F3 |
| 19. | Mevcut yetişkin eğitimi kursları hakkında bilgim olmadığı için | 2.04 | .98 | .96 | F6 |
| 52. | Ulaşım masrafları çok tuttuğu için | 2.04 | 1.12 | 1.25 | F1 |
| 27. | Çevremde açılan kurslarla ilgili duyurulara hiç rastlamadığım için | 2.00 | 1.05 | 1.11 | F6 |
| 55. | Evdeki işlerden zaman bulamadığım için | 1.99 | 1.10 | 1.22 | F7 |
| 18. | Zamanımın çoğunu ailemle birlikte geçirmek istediğim için | 1.97 | 1.03 | 1.06 | F7 |
| 30. | Zaten çok az olan boş zamanımı harcamak istemediğim için | 1.96 | 1.04 | 1.09 | F3 |
| 65. | Açılan kurslardan haberim olmadığı için | 1.96 | 1.06 | 1.12 | F6 |
| 50. | Kursları düzenleyen kuruluşlar hakkında bilgim olmadığı için | 1.90 | 1.01 | 1.03 | F6 |
| 73. | Kurs saatleri uzun sürdüğü için | 1.89 | .96 | .92 | F8 |
| 54. | Kursları bitirmek uzun sürdüğü için | 1.82 | .92 | .84 | F8 |
| 58. | İş yerimden izin alamadığım için | 1.80 | 1.09 | 1.19 | F3 |
| 37. | Ailem parasal destekte bulunmadığı için | 1.75 | 1.08 | 1.18 | F1 |
| 53. | Kurslara katılmanın benim gelirimin artmasına faydası olacağına inanmadığım için | 1.69 | 1.00 | 1.00 | F2 |
| 21. | İlgi duyduğum konularda kurs bulamadığım için | 1.68 | .91 | .83 | F2 |
| 35. | Bu kurslarda neler yapıldığını bilmediğim için | 1.68 | .92 | .84 | F6 |
| 56. | İstediğim konuda kurs açılmadığı için | 1.64 | .94 | .89 | F2 |
| 11. | Kurslara katılmaya ilgi duymadığım için | 1.61 | .90 | .82 | F2 |

| It. No. | | Mean | SD | Var. | Fac |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26. | Bir kursu bitirmemin iş bulmama yardımı olacağına inanmadığım için | 1.58 | .92 | .84 | F2 |
| 6. | Çocuklarımı bırakacak yer bulamadığım için | 1.58 | 1.02 | 1.03 | F7 |
| 33. | Kurslar ihtiyaçlarımıza cevap verebilecek düzeyde olmadığı için | 1.58 | .82 | .67 | F2 |
| 34. | Kursa birlikte gidecek insan bulamadığım için | 1.57 | .88 | .78 | F5 |
| 20. | Genç öğrencilerle rekabet edemeyeceğimi düşündüğüm için | 1.56 | .91 | .82 | F6 |
| 16. | Mevcut kursları düzenleyen kurumların nitelikli olduğuna inanmadığım için | 1.54 | .82 | .67 | F2 |
| 24. | Bu kurslara ne tür insanların gittiklerini bilmediğim için | 1.52 | .85 | .72 | F6 |
| 22. | Kursların bana bir imkan sağlayacağına inanmadığım için | 1.51 | .80 | .64 | F2 |
| 70. | Böyle şeyler para kazandırmaz. | 1.49 | .88 | .77 | F2 |
| 36. | Ek bir işte çalıştığım için zamanım yok. | 1.49 | .93 | .86 | F3 |
| 42. | Sıkılacağımı düşündüğüm için | 1.49 | .80 | .63 | F5 |
| 66. | Bir eğitim öğretim faaliyetine katılma ihtiyacı duymadığım için | 1.48 | .82 | .67 | F2 |
| 17. | Eğitimin bana işimde/mesleğimde yardımcı olacağına inanmadığım için | 1.47 | .84 | .71 | F2 |
| 31. | Benim öğrenim düzeyim çok düşük olduğu için | 1.46 | .85 | .72 | F5 |
| 63. | öğrendiklerimi çok çabuk unuttuğum için | 1.44 | .78 | .61 | F5 |
| 40. | Sınıf içinde, herkesin ortasında, bana sorulacak soruları cevaplamak istemezdim. | 1.42 | .79 | .62 | F5 |
| 15. | Kurslara katılmayı gereksiz bulduğum için | 1.42 | .75 | .57 | F2 |
| 46. | Kurslara benim kadar yaşlı insanlar pek gitmediği için | 1.42 | .83 | .69 | F5 |
| 4. | Bu kurslardaki öğretmenleri pek fazla tanımadığım için | 1.41 | .80 | .64 | F8 |
| 47. | Kursların zor olduğunu düşündüğüm için | 1.36 | .70 | .49 | F5 |
| 41. | Kursta başarısız olmaktan korktuğum için | 1.36 | .74 | .55 | F5 |
| 28. | Ailem izin vermediği için | 1.35 | .78 | .61 | F4 |
| 62. | Sağlığım bozuk olduğu için | 1.35 | .73 | .54 | F5 |
| 67. | Yeni şeyler öğrenmek zor geldiği için | 1.34 | .69 | .48 | F5 |
| 25. | Yaşlı olduğum için | 1.34 | .76 | .57 | F5 |
| 68. | Yabancı bir ortama girmekten çekindiğim için | 1.31 | .68 | .46 | F5 |
| 64. | Okuma yazmam zayıf olduğu için | 1.29 | .68 | .47 | F5 |
| 49. | Tembel biri olduğumu düşündüğüm için | 1.28 | .65 | .43 | F5 |
| 10. | Verilen dersleri kafamın almayacağını düşündüğüm için | 1.28 | .63 | .39 | F5 |

| It. No. | Mean | SD | Var. | Fac |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. öğrenme yeteneğime güvenemediğim için | 1.26 | .60 | .37 | F5 |
| 7. Kursa gitmeme eşim izin vermediği için | 1.26 | .67 | .45 | F4 |
| 8. Kurs öğretmenlerinin kursiyerlere iyi davranmadığını duymuştum. | 1.24 | .65 | .42 | F8 |
| 57. Kursa gitmeme kaynanam izin vermediği için | 1.22 | .71 | .50 | F4 |
| 48. Kurslara katıldığımda çevremdekilerin bana güleceğini düşündüğüm için | 1.19 | .57 | .32 | F5 |
| 43. Kurslarda yer bulamadığım için | 1.17 | .52 | .27 | F4 |
| 71. Kurs öğretmeni karşı cinsten olabileceği için | 1.17 | .59 | .35 | F4 |
| 51. Kursa gidersem benim cahil olduğumu düşünürler. | 1.15 | .55 | .30 | F5 |

# Appendix M

English translation of RENOPAS items (74 items)

1. Because I don't have the time for participation.
2. Because I don't want to participate.
3. Because I think I can't afford the expenses necessary for the course.
4. Because I don't know the instructors in those courses well enough.
5. Because courses offered don't interest me.
6. Because it's difficult for me to find any place to leave my children to be taken care of.
7. Because my spouse don't allow me to participate.
8. I have heard that the course instructors don't treat the course participants well.
9. Because I don't have confidence in my learning abilities.
10. Because I think I won't understand the lectures given
11. Because I am not interested in taking courses.
12. Because my boss (employer) doesn't provide financial support that is necessary.
13. Because the courses I wanted to participate so far haven't been at convenient times.
14. Because I usually prefer to learn on my own.
15. Because I find it unnecessary to participate in courses.
16. Because I don't believe the institutions organizing available courses are qualified.
17. Because I don't believe training would help me in my job/profession.
18. Because I want to spend most of my time with my family.
19. Because I don't have information about the available adult education courses.
20. Because I think I can't compete with younger students.
21. Because I can't find any courses on subjects that I am interested in.
22. Because I don't believe the courses would provide me with opportunities.
23. Because the courses are at inconvenient locations.
24. Because I don't know what kind of people attend such courses.
25. Because I am old.
26. Because I don't believe completing a course would help me in finding a job.
27. Because I have never seen any advertisement about the courses opened in my environment.
28. Because my family did not allow me.
29. Because I get tired at work.
30. Because I don't want to waste my time that is already very limited.
31. Because my education is very poor.
32. Because I don't have enough time for participating in courses regularly.
33. Because the courses are not sufficient for satisfying our needs.
34. Because I can't find anybody to attend courses together with me.
35. Because I don't know what is going on in these courses.
36. I have no time because I have another job.
37. Because my family did not support me financially.
38. Because earning a living is of greater trouble.

39. Because courses are very expensive.
40. I wouldn't like to answer questions in front of everybody in class.
41. Because I am afraid of being unsucessful in the course.
42. Because I think I would be bored.
43. Because I can't usually find place in the courses.
44. Because there is nobody to take care of my job at work.
45. Because I have to take care of my family.
46. Because people who are as old as me do not usually attend courses.
47. Because I think the courses are difficult.
48. Because I think people around me would laugh at me if I participated in courses.
49. Because I think I am lazy.
50. Because I don't have information about the institutions organizing the courses.
51. If I take a course people would think that I am ignorant.
52. Because the transportation expenses are very high.
53. Because I don't believe participating in courses would help increase my income.
54. Because it takes too long to finish the courses.
55. For I can't find time because of housework.
56. Because no courses are offered I have desired.
57. Because my mother-in-law don't allow me to participate.
58. Because I can't get permission from the work place.
59. Because I can't decide on what subject I want to take a course.
60. Because I am not financially sufficient.
61. Because where I work it is very busy.
62. Because I am not healthy.
63. Because I forget what I have learned very easily.
64. Because my reading and writing skills are not adequate.
65. Because I haven't heard about the courses offered.
66. Because I see no necessity for participating in a learning activity.
67. Because learning new things is difficult.
68. Because I feel shy in an unfamiliar environment.
69. Because I have no extra time for such things.
70. Such things do not cause to earn money.
71. Because the course instructor would be of the other sex.
72. Because I don't want to be a student again.
73. Because course hours last too long.
74. Because transportation is very difficult.

# Appendix N

The final form of RENOPAS with 67 items

# YETİŞKİNLERİN EĞİTİM ETKİNLİKLERİNE KATILMAMA NEDENLERİ

Bu çalışma, yetişkinlerin okul dışında herhangi bir eğitim öğretim etkinliğine katılmasına engel olan nedenleri araştırmak için yapılmaktadır. Toplanan bilgiler kişisel değil toplu olarak araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilecektir.

Elinizdeki anket iki bölümden oluşmaktadır. Gerekli açıklamalar her bölümün başında yapılmıştır.

Bana yardımcı olduğunuz için şimdiden size teşekkür ederim.

Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi
Araştırma Görevlisi
Cem Kirazoğlu

## 1. BÖLÜM

Bu bölümde sizinle ilgili bazı sorular sorulmaktadır. Lütfen her soruyu dikkatle okuduktan sonra size en uygun cevabın yanındaki parantezin içine çarpı işareti koyunuz.

1. Cinsiyetiniz: ( ) Kadın ( ) Erkek

2. Yaşınız aşağıdaki gruplardan hangisine uymaktadır?

   ( ) 14-19 ( ) 20-24 ( ) 25-29 ( ) 30-39 ( ) 40-49 ( ) 50 yaş ve üstü

3. Eğitim durumunuz?

| | |
|---|---|
| ( ) İlkokul mezunu | ( ) İlkokuldan terk |
| ( ) Ortaokul mezunu | ( ) Ortaokuldan terk |
| ( ) Meslek okulu orta kısmı mezunu<br>Okulun türü:_____ | ( ) Meslek ortaokulundan terk |
| ( ) Lise mezunu | ( ) Liseden terk |
| ( ) Meslek okulu lise kısmı mezunu<br>Okulun türü:_____ | ( ) Meslek lisesinden terk |
| ( ) Yüksekokul mezunu<br>Bölüm:_____ | ( ) Yüksekokuldan terk |
| ( ) Üniversite mezunu<br>Bölüm:_____ | ( ) Üniversiteden terk |
| ( ) Lisansüstü<br>Bölüm:_____ | |

4. Medeni durumunuz?

   ( ) Bekar ( ) Evli ( ) Boşanmış ( ) Eşi vefat etmiş

5. Çocuğunuz var mı? Varsa kaç tane?

   ( ) Yok ( ) 1 çocuk ( ) 2 çocuk ( ) 3 çocuk ( ) 4 ve daha fazla

6. Ne iş yapıyorsunuz? (İşsizseniz ya da ev kadınıysanız, işsiz ya da ev kadını diye yazınız) _____
   (Örnek: Muhasebeci, vasıfsız işçi, tornacı, tezgahtar, şoför, elektrik mühendisi, işportacı vs.)

7. Çalıştığınız kurum ne tür bir kurum?

( ) özel bir firma ya da şirket ( ) Devlet kurumu ( ) Kendi işim

8. (Bu soruyu evliyseniz cevaplandırın) Eşiniz ne iş yapıyor? (İşsizse ya da ev kadınıysa, işsiz ya da ev kadını diye yazınız) _____
(Örnek: Muhasebeci, vasıfsız işçi, tornacı, tezgahtar, şoför, elektrik mühendisi, işportacı vs.)

9. (Bu soruyu evliyseniz cevaplandırın) Eşinizin çalıştığı kurum ne ne tür bir kurum?

( ) özel bir firma ya da şirket ( ) Devlet kurumu ( ) Kendi işim

10. Hangi semtte oturuyorsunuz? _____

11. Kaç yıldır İstanbul'da oturuyorsunuz?

( ) 5 yıldan az ( ) 5-9 yıl ( ) 10-15 yıl ( ) 15 yıldan fazla

12. Oturduğunuz ev sizin mi?

( ) Evet ( ) Hayır, kirada oturuyoruz

13. (Bu soruyu, ev sahibiyseniz cevaplandırın) başka sahip olduğunuz ev var mı?

( ) Evet ( ) Hayır

14. Ailenizin maddi durumunu nasıl görüyorsunuz?

( ) Az gelirli ( ) Ortanın altında ( ) Orta ( ) Ortanın üstünde ( ) Yüksek gelirli

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

( ) Alt düzey ( ) Ortanın altında ( ) Orta ( ) Ortanın üstünde ( ) Üst düzey

## 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 sayılardan 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 olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 2. Kurs için gerekli olan harcamaları karşılayamayacağımı düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 3. Bu kurslardaki öğretmenleri pek fazla tanımadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 4. Çocuklarımı bırakacak yer bulamadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 5. Kursa gitmeme eşim izin vermediği 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 almayacağını düşündüğüm için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 9. Kurslara katılmaya ilgi duymadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 10. Kurslara katılmayı gereksiz bulduğum için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 11. Mevcut kursları düzenleyen kurumların nitelikli olduğuna inanmadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 12. Eğitimin bana işimde/mesleğimde yardımcı olacağına inanmadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 13. Zamanımın çoğunu ailemle birlikte geçirmek istediğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |

| Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri | Hiç doğru değil | Biraz doğru | Oldukça doğru | Çok doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. Mevcut yetişkin eğitimi kursları hakkında bilgim olmadığı 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 inanmadığım için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 18. Rahatça gidebileceğim bir yerde kurs olmadığı için .. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 19. Bu kurslara ne tür insanların gittiklerini bilmediğim için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 20. Yaşlı olduğum için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 21. Bir kursu bitirmemin iş bulmama yardımı 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 ihtiyaçlarımıza cevap verebilecek düzeyde olmadığı için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 29. Kursa 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) |

| Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri | Hiç doğru değil | Biraz doğru | Oldukça doğru | Çok doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 güleceğini 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. Kursa gidersem benim cahil olduğumu düşünürler. ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 47. Ulaşım masrafları çok tuttuğu için ..... | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 48. Kurslara katılmanın benim gelirimin 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) |
| 51. İstediğim 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 çok 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) |

| Yetişkin Eğitimi Etkinliklerine Katılmama Nedenleri | Hiç doğru değil | Biraz doğru | Oldukça doğru | Çok doğru |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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) |