Social Exclusion Perceptions of Pre-school Teachers*

Meral Taner Derman

Uludag University, Faculty of Education, Department of ElementaryEducation, Program of Preschool Education
E-mail: mtaner@uludag.edu.tr

ABSTRACT The aim of this research is to determine social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers with 1 to 10 years of experience. A total of 150 preschool teachers participated in the research. Of these, 8 of them were males and 142 of them were females. Also, 124 of the teachers had 1 to 5 years of experience and 26 of them had 6 to 10 years of experience. The t-test and correlation analysis were used in analyzing the data. According to this sudy, teachers working in the Southeastern Anatolia Region have higher social exclusion perceptions in social rights and social participation dimensions, while teachers working in the Mediterranean Region have higher social exclusion perceptions in cultural integration dimension. Teachers working in city centers have higher social exclusion perceptions in the social rights dimension and teachers working in counties have higher social exclusion perceptions in cultural integration dimension. It is also seen that these differences caused a significant difference.

INTRODUCTION

As a result of globalization, the world has got richer but inequality, injustice and precarities have become more common. This has increased the social exclusion levels of individuals (Bayram et al. 2010). Social exclusion is the lack of social, political and cultural resources and activities at different levels of society and individuals (Mitchell 2000). Social exclusion is a social, economical and political concept and it describes social policy problems such as poverty, inequality, unemployment and precarity. Social exclusion can be considered the opposite of social integration and cohesion, which reflects social integration and social acceptance. It is a period when individuals lack basic needs that enable them to reach opportunities to form their futures, sever their connections with the society or become deprived of civil, political, economical and social rights. One of the important aspects of social exclusion is lacking fundamental rights. It is an important notion regarding the lack of fundamental rights about citizenship that determines basic living standards and taking economical and social opportunities (Sapancali 2005).

Social exclusion also influences the individuals' consuming habits, their feelings such as inadequacy and insecurity and other aspects of the individuals' lives by forming political exclusion process (Erdogdu 2004). According to Sahin (2009: 85), the most important feature of social exclusion is to feel various social problems at the same time.

Some features of individuals with high social exclusion risks are feeling insecure, feeling lost, powerless, abandoned and having difficulties in integrating with the social structure of society. Because of these features, these people are faced with prostitution, alcoholism and thievery (Seyyar 2003). Furthermore, it is stated that social exclusion causes stress, denunciation, powerlessness, despair and fatalism and it weakens social bonds and increases crime rates and health problems (Cattel 2001). Sahin (2009) stated that individuals who cannot satisfy their vital, cultural and social needs have difficulties in fitting into the society. According to Stenseng et al. (2015), social exclusion predicts impaired development of dispositional self-regulation .

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are works on people living in disadvantageous regions (Adaman and Keyder 2006; Aksungur 2006), handicapped individuals (Ozgokceler 2007; Erguden 2008; Dariyemez 2012), the children who depend on the protection (Kalayci 2007), elders (Genc and Dalkilic 2013; Kibler et al. 2015), Romans (Genc et al. 2015; Demirel 2012), immigrants (Fernandez et al. 2015), foreign nationals (Dedeoglu 2011), broken families (Yusufoglu and Kizmaz 2016) but there is no work on social exclusion on the state of teachers. This is an important indicator regarding the originality of the work.

Aim

The aim of the research is to determine social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers with 1 to 10 years of experience. The following questions were asked through this aim:

1. What are social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers?
2. Do social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers differ by gender?
3. Do social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers differ by their places of duty and their residential areas?
4. Do social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers differ by experience?

METHODOLOGY

This study is a research model that aims at determining the social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers. The survey model is a research model to reveal and identify an existing situation (Karasar 2005). The population of the study was formed of preschool teachers with at most a 10-year experience who worked in formal preschool education institutions over seven different regions of Turkey. The sample of the research comprised 150 preschool teachers. Of these, 8 of them were males and 142 of them were females. Also, 124 of the teachers had 1 to 5 years of experience and 26 of them had 6 to 10 years of experience. The reason of limiting the study to teachers who have at most 10 years of experience is the difficulty of finding teachers with more experience in the eastern part of the country.

As data collection tools, the information form was used to get demographical information of teachers, and the Social Exclusion Scale was used to survey the social exclusion perceptions. A five-point Likert-type Social Exclusion Scale with 35 articles, which was developed by Jehoel-Gijsbers and Vrooman (2007), and adapted into Turkish by Bayram et al. (2010), was used in order to determine the social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers. The scale is formed of four different subscales such as deprivation, attaining social rights, social participation and cultural integration. Attaining social rights dimension is discussed in two different sub-scales. The first sub-scale involves benefitting from social rights and institutions and the second sub-scale involves benefitting from homes and secure environment.

Each article changes between "never" and "always". High scores on social exclusion scale show higher social exclusion levels. In other words, higher scores show that deprivation is high, benefit from institutions and aids are low, there are not enough proper home and environment conditions, social participation is low and cultural integration and norms are not satisfied. In the data analysis process, the t-test was used to determine whether social exclusion perceptions of teachers differ in terms of gender and experience and a one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether they differ in terms of duty place and region.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers with 1 to 10 years of experience were determined within the course of this study.

It was seen in Table 1 that the average of social exclusion perceptions of female preschool

Table 1: Social exclusion levels of preschool teachers in terms of gender

	Gender	n	Mean	Std. deviation	t	p
Deprivation	Female	142	18.66	5.93	0.55	0.58
	Male	8	17.50	2.67		
Social rights (benefitting from institutions and aids)	Female	142	10.95	4.76	-2.69	0.008
	Male	8	15.50	0.92		
Social rights (benefitting from proper home and environment)	Female	142	20.07	7.42	0.39	0.69
	Male	8	19.00	6.80		
Social participation	Female	142	18.20	6.15	1.68	0.09
	Male	8	14.50	3.82		
Cultural integration	Female	142	10.84	2.97	-1.56	0.12
	Male	8	12.50	1.77		
Social exclusion	Female	142	78.73	20.68	-0.04	0.97
	Male	8	79.00	9.62		

teachers is 78.73 and the average of social exclusion perceptions of male preschool teachers is 79. At the end of t-test, it was seen that there is not a statistical difference between the social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers by gender. There are works in the literature defending that social exclusion perception does not change by gender (Adaman and Keyder 2008; Adaman and Ardic 2008). When it is analyzed on the basis of sub-dimensions, it is seen that social exclusion perceptions of male teachers are at 15.50 and those of female teachers are at 10.95 at social rights dimension including benefitting from institutions and aids. It is seen that rates of male preschool teachers are higher and this difference causes a statistical significant difference.

It was seen from Table 2 that the average of social exclusion perceptions of pre-school teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience is 79.26 and the average of social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers with 6 to 10 years of experience is 76.31. At the end of t-test, it was seen that there is not a statistical difference by terms of experience. When it is analyzed on sub-dimension basis, it is seen that social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience are higher at social rights dimension including benefitting from proper home and environment and this difference causes a statistical significant difference.

It was also seen from Table 3 that the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in Marmara Region is 77.11, the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in Aegean Region is 82.00, the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in Mediterranean Region is 72.33, the aver-

age of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in Central Anatolia Region is 73.50, the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in Black Sea Region is 71.00, the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in Eastern Anatolia Region is 77.20, and the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in Southeastern Anatolia Region is 89.43. It is seen as a result of variance analysis that there is no statistical difference in terms of region. When it is analyzed in terms of sub-dimensions, it is seen that teachers working in Southeastern Anatolia Region have higher social exclusion perceptions in social rights and social participation dimensions and teachers working in Mediterranean Region have higher social exclusion perceptions in the cultural integration dimension. Taskaya et al. (2015) determined in their research that housing (lack of boarding) is the most important problem regarding personal rights of teachers. They also emphasized that a lot of teachers find the conditions of rural areas harsh and they generally try to be appointed from villages to cities and from East to the West. Likewise, Koyuncu (2011) stated that housing is the most common problem of female teachers in rural areas.

It is seen in Table 4 that the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in villages is 69.90, the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in counties is 78.85, and the average of social exclusion perceptions of teachers working in city centers is 80.95. It is seen as a result of variance analysis that there is no statistical difference in terms of region of residence. When it is analyzed in terms of sub-dimensions, it is seen that teachers working in city centers have higher social exclusion

Table 2: Social exclusion levels of preschool teachers in terms of experience

Experience		n	Mean	Std. deviation	t	p
Deprivation	1-5 year	124	18.77	6.02	0.80	0.42
	6-10 year	26	17.77	4.61		
Social rights (benefitting from	1-5 year	124	11.08	4.89	-0.67	0.50
institutions and aids)	6-10 year	26	11.77	4.04		
Social rights (benefitting from						
proper home and environment)	1-5 year	124	20.63	7.25	2.26	0.02
	6-10 year	26	17.08	7.36		
Social participation	1-5 year	124	17.95	5.87	-0.21	0.83
	6-10 year	26	18.23	7.17		
Cultural integration	1-5 year	124	10.82	2.91	-1.01	0.31
	6-10 year	26	11.46	3.06		
Social exclusion	1-5 year	124	79.26	20.66	0.67	0.50
	6-10 year	26	76.31	18.17		

Table 3: Social exclusion levels of preschool teachers in terms of assigned location

Regions		n	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error	F	p
Deprivation	Marmara Region	72	18.69	4.99	0.59	2.16	0.05
	Aegean Region	4	18.00	0.00	0.00		
	Mediterranean Region	6	20.33	9.85	4.02		
	Central Anatolia Region	12	15.17	4.32	1.25		
	Black Sea Region	8	17.50	1.60	0.57		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	20	16.80	4.83	1.08		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	28	21.14	7.88	1.49		
	Total	150	18.60	5.80	0.47		
Social Rights (Benefitting from Institutions and Aids)	Marmara Region	72	11.08	3.55	0.42	1.79	0.10
	Aegean Region	4	15.00	0.00	0.00		
	Mediterranean Region	6	11.00	4.98	2.03		
	Central Anatolia Region	12	11.67	4.89	1.41		
	Black Sea Region	8	8.50	0.53	0.19		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	20	9.60	5.01	1.12		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	28	12.71	7.11	1.34		
	Total	150	11.20	4.75	0.39		
Social Rights (Benefitting from Proper Home and Environment)	Marmara Region	72	18.31	7.26	0.86	3.21	0.005
	Aegean Region	4	22.00	0.00	0.00		
	Mediterranean Region	6	14.67	4.50	1.84		
	Central Anatolia Region	12	18.33	4.25	1.23		
	Black Sea Region	8	23.50	5.88	2.08		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	20	22.00	4.68	1.05		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	28	23.57	9.49	1.79		
	Total	150	20.01	7.37	0.60		
Social Participation	Marmara Region	72	17.50	5.79	0.68	2.39	0.03
	Aegean Region	4	19.00	0.00	0.00		
	Mediterranean Region	6	13.67	4.93	2.01		
	Central Anatolia Region	12	16.17	2.86	0.82		
	Black Sea Region	8	15.00	4.28	1.51		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	20	19.20	4.92	1.09		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	28	20.86	8.28	1.56		
	Total	150	18.00	6.09	0.49		
Cultural Integration	Marmara Region	72	11.53	3.16	0.37	6.95	0.00
	Aegean Region	4	8.00	0.00	0.00		
	Mediterranean Region	6	12.67	2.25	0.92		
	Central Anatolia Region	12	12.17	2.85	0.82		
	Black Sea Region	8	6.50	0.53	0.19		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	20	9.60	2.01	0.45		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	28	11.14	1.84	0.35		
	Total	150	10.93	2.94	0.24		
Social Exclusion	Marmara Region	72	77.11	17.21	2.03	1.92	0.08
	Aegean Region	4	82.00	0.00	0.00		
	Mediterranean Region	6	72.33	17.76	7.25		
	Central Anatolia Region	12	73.50	11.63	3.36		
	Black Sea Region	8	71.00	10.69	3.78		
	Eastern Anatolia Region	20	77.20	14.24	3.18		
	Southeastern Anatolia Region	28	89.43	32.00	6.05		
	Total	150	78.75	20.22	1.65		

perceptions in social rights dimension and teachers working in counties have higher social exclusion perceptions in cultural integration dimension. It is also seen that this difference causes a significant difference. Ozpinar and Sarpkaya (2010) established that "being destitute of cultural activities like theatre and cinema" is the most common problem of female teachers working in villages. It was determined in a research conducted with physical education teachers by Can and Soyer (2008), that living satisfaction levels of teachers living in villages are lower than the others.

CONCLUSION

It is seen that male preschool teachers' social exclusion perceptions of social rights dimen-

Table 4: Social exclusion levels of preschool teachers in terms of assigned residential zone

Regions		n	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error	F	p
Deprivation	Village	20	17.50	3.68	0.82	0.43	0.65
	County	52	18.88	5.86	0.81		
	City center	78	18.69	6.22	0.70		
	Total	150	18.60	5.80	0.47		
Social Rights	Village	20	7.50	3.98	0.89	8.40	0.00
(Benefitting from	County	52	11.19	3.28	0.45		
Institutions and	City center	78	12.15	5.30	0.60		
Aids)	Total	150	11.20	4.75	0.39		
Social Rights	Village	20	17.80	6.76	1.51	1.04	0.36
(Benefitting from	County	52	20.38	5.98	0.83		
Proper Home and	City center	78	20.33	8.29	0.94		
Environment)	Total	150	20.01	7.37	0.60		
Social Participation	Village	20	17.60	6.34	1.42	1.68	0.19
	County	52	16.88	5.48	0.76		
	City center	78	18.85	6.36	0.72		
	Total	150	18.00	6.09	0.50		
Cultural Integration	Village	20	9.50	1.73	0.39	3.46	0.03
	County	52	11.50	2.90	0.40		
	City center	78	10.92	3.10	0.35		
	Total	150	10.93	2.94	0.24		
Social Exclusion	Village	20	69.90	17.33	3.87	2.42	0.09
	County	52	78.85	16.46	2.28		
	City center	78	80.95	22.64	2.56		
	Total	150	78.75	20.22	1.65		

sion including benefitting from institutions and aids are higher than female preschool teachers.

It is seen that social exclusion perceptions of preschool teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience are higher at social rights dimension including benefitting from proper home and environment.

It is seen that preschool teachers working in Southeastern Anatolia Region have higher social exclusion perceptions in social rights and social participation dimensions and teachers working in Mediterranean Region have higher social exclusion perceptions in the cultural integration dimension.

Preschool teachers working in city centers have higher social exclusion perceptions in social rights dimension and teachers working in counties have higher social exclusion perceptions in cultural integration dimension.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study may be conducted with teachers from other fields. Personal rights of teachers working in eastern regions and rural areas must be improved. New government policies must be developed in order to minimize housing, cultural integration and social interaction problems of teachers.

NOTE

REFERENCES

Adaman F, Ardic OP 2008. Social exclusion in the slum areas of large cities in Turkey. *New Perspectives on Turkey*, 38(1): 29-60.

Adaman F, Keyder C 2006. Poverty and Social Exclusion in Slums and Suburbs of large cities in Turkey. From <http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/social_ inclusion/docs/2006/study_turkey_tr.pdf.> (Retrieved on 9 September 2015).

Aksungur U 2006. *Experiences of Social Exclusion of the Youth Living in Altindag, Ankara.* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Institute of Social Sciences. Ankara: Middle East Technical University.

Bayram N, Sam N, Aytac S, Aytac M 2010. Life satisfaction and social exclusion. *"IS, GUC" Industrial Relations and Human Resources Journal,* 12(4): 79-92.

Can Y, Soyer F 2008. The relationship between occupational and socio-ecomomic expectation with life satisfaction: A study on the teachers of physical education. *Ataturk Journal of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, (atabesbd),* 10(4): 24-33.

Cattel V 2001. Poor people, poor places, and poor health: The mediating role of social networks and social capital. *Social Science and Medicine,* 52(10): 1501-1516.

Dariyemez M 2012. *In the Context of Social Exclusion, the Abstraction of People with Disabilities from Working Life: As in the Case in Antalya.* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Social Sciences Institue. Isparta: Süleyman Demirel University.

Dedeoglu S 2011. Social exclusion of foreign immigrants in Turkey: The case of Azerbaijani women workers in the Istanbul garment industry. *Journal of Ankara University Political Sciences,* 66(1): 27-48.

Demirel N 2012. *Comparative Research on Problem of Social Exclusion of Romans Community Level.* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Social Sciences Institute. Yalova: Yalova University.

Erdogdu S 2004. A "European" Concept in Social Policy: Social Exclusion. Journal of Work Environment, 75. From <http://calismaortami.fisek.org.tr/wp-content/uploads/calisma_ortami75.pdf> (Retrieved on 10 September 2015).

Erguden AD 2008. *The Evaluation of Physically Disabled Peoples Lives in the Concept of Social Exclusion.* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Social Sciences Institute. Ankara: Hacettepe University.

Fernández I, Silván-Ferrero P, Molero F, Gaviria E, Garciá-Ael C 2015. Perceived discrimination and well-being in Romanian immigrants: The role of social support. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16(4): 857-870.

Genc Y, Dalkilic P 2013. Social exclusion syndrome and social expectations of the elders. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 6(4): 461-482.

Genc Y, Taylan HH, Baris I 2015. The perception of social exclusion and its role on the process of education and academic achivement of Romani children. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies,* 33: 79-97.

Jehoel-Gijsbers G, Vrooman C 2007. *Explaining Social Exclusion: A Theoretical Model Tested in the Netherlands.* The Hague: The Netherlands Institute for Social Research/scp.

Kalayci H 2007. *The Risk of Social Excluding Who Needed to be Protected in Orphagenes.* Doctoral Thesis, Unpublished. Insitute of Social Sciences. Sakarya: Sakarya University.

Karasar N 2005. *Scientific Research Method.* Ankara: Nobel Publishing.

Kibler E, Wainwright T, Kautonen T, Blackburn R 2015. Can social exclusion against "Older Entrepreneurs" be managed? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(S1): 193–208.

Koyuncu O 2011. *Woman Teacher's Problems and Social Gender (Case of Diyarbakir City).* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Educational Sciences Institute. Ankara: Ankara University.

Mitchell A 2000. Social exclusion: An ILO perspective (Review of the book). *Industrial Relations,* 55(2): 357-359.

Ozgokceler S 2007. *Problematic of Social Exclusion with Regard to Evaluation of the Social Policy of Handicapped People.* Master Thesis, Unpublished. Social Sciences Institute. Bursa: Uludag University.

Ozpinar M, Sarpkaya R 2010. Problems of primary school teachers working in villages. *Journal of Pamukkale University Education Faculty,* 27: 17-29

Sahin T 2009. *Social Exclusion and Povert Relationship.* T.R. Prime Minister's General Directorate of Social Assistance and Solidarity Social Aid Dissertation, Ankara.

Sapancali F 2005. Social exclusion problem in European Union and fighting against this problem. *Labor and Society,* 3: 51-106.

Seyyar A 2003. Fighting Against Poverty in Terms of Social Policy. *Symposium of Poverty,* Ahmet Emre Bilgili ve Ibrahim Altan (Editors), Deniz Feneri Publications, Istanbul, 31 May-1 June 2003, pp. 38-69.

Stenseng F, Belsky J, Skalicka V, Wichstrom L 2015. Social exclusion predicts impaired self-regulation: A 2-year longitudinal panel study including the transition from pre-school to school. *Journal of Personality,* 83(2): 212–220.

Taskaya SM, Turhan M, Yetkin R 2015. Problems of the teachers working n rural areas (Agri province as example). *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences,* 6(18): 198-210.

Yusuofoglu OS, Kizmaz Z 2016. Poverty and social exclusion in broken family: Elazig case. *Social Sciences (NWSASOS)*, 11(1): 27-40.