

DIFFERENCE OF OTHERS WHEN DEFINING "WE": Evaluation of Open Education System Students within the Gender Inequality¹

Lecturer Dr. Başak Kalkan

Anadolu University

Open and Distance Faculty, Türkiye

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülfem Gürses

Anadolu University

Open and Distance Faculty, Türkiye

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to show whether the definition of "we" can be made for women having education in distance education system within the framework of structuralist and post-structuralist social gender parameters and to determine whether distance education system is a source for reproduction of women under their areas of profession. The population of the study is 125444 students who were awarded with certificate of achievement in the academic year of 2015-2016. With fixed data in Excel tables being drafted, all analyses were conducted with 125418 data. Within the framework of study in which the variables of gender and region are assessed in terms of selection of department and program of successful students enrolled in Open Education System. In terms of answering the questions of whether there are significant difference between social gender and department selection and whether social gender cause regional differences in department selection, Chi-Square Analysis is a statistical method looking for answer for these questions. For the frequency in each section of Chi-Square contingency tables to be under 20 in general table, the section frequency of which is less than 5 was kept out of scope. As the result of the studies conducted, it is seen that the departments for which gender variable varies in favor of women are Office Management and Executive Assistance, Theology, Human Resources Management, Finance, Media and Communication, Turkish Language Literature, Social Services, Sociology and History Departments, while the departments which are significant for men are Justice, Labor Economics and Industrial Relations, Foreign Trade, Philosophy, Public Relations and Publicity, Economics, Business Administration, Public Administration, Hospitality Management, Logistics, Sport Management, History, International Relations and Local Governments.

Keywords: Open education, distance education, structuralist social gender, post-structuralist social gender, women studies.

Introduction

The effects of the distance education system on the woman's change and transformation process are especially noteworthy as one of the most debated topics in recent years. While the economic and cultural influences in the underdeveloped and developing countries especially reproduce the social identity of women, the distance education system is accepted as an important building stone in the identity formation of women.

¹ This study was published in Turkish by AUAd (Anadolu University Journal of Open Education Practices and Research) 2017, Volume 3, Issue 1, pages 160-187.

Distance education is a very important opportunity for women because of gender inequality in education. Although the thought that education provided by distance education system shall help women completing their education by reaching them in their homes because of place and time limitation, inadequacy of resources, and the fact that responsibilities of women are much more than those of men (Demiray and Curabay, 2000) has no return in critical reading, it leads the changing process of women in developing countries such as Turkey. According to the study findings in which the reasons of selection of the students enrolled in Anadolu University Secondary University application are assessed in terms of social gender, it is observed that there is no significant relationship between career development, income increase, and variables of family life and social gender. (Gürses & Adar, 2013) It is seen as a pleasing table that this difference decreases for women. However, the point to note here is that the women who are the sample of the research are the those who are studying in Secondary University. While education is important in that it shows the changing face of women in social life, it is a fact that the struggle for existence in the public area is still continuing for women who could not have had university education.

Education is one of the areas where women's public area identity struggle is most intense. Women's education barriers in Turkey are listed in the 2008 report of Center for Development of Women's Status as follows:

- Social gender roles in the traditional structure promote traditional culture and constitute one of the most important obstacles to the enrollment of girls.
- Traditional thought patterns cause families to keep their daughters at home and not send them to the school.
- Girls are given in marriage at an early age.
- Families having a economically low income level have difficulty in sending their children to school. Families who have had to provide educational opportunity for one of their children keep daughters away from education for them to help house works (helping their mothers at home, working in the field, etc.) and they make their choice for education for boys.
- Many children are excluded from the education system because they work in some branches, such as seasonal agricultural work and home work.
- Differences in geographical/regional development affect educational attainment levels. Education participation rates in regions having comparatively low level of income decrease. Participation rates in education are especially low in the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia Regions.
- Population registration problems are also important. It is difficult (though not impossible) for the unregistered children to be monitored by the public institutions.
- The scattered settlements in rural areas cause problems in providing adequate education services in areas where transportation is limited. A large number of children are forced to make long journeys to reach the school. When roads are closed in winters, the attendance rate to the school is further reduced.
- Infrastructure facilities in some schools (dinner hall, toilet, etc.) are not suitable for meeting the needs of girls.
- One third of the current elementary school teachers are females. However, most of the female teachers work in cities and towns. The absence of female teachers who could be role models in the villages means that there are fewer elements to encourage girls to go to school (Demiray, 2013)

The Report of the Center for Development of Women's Status shows that barriers in women's education processes can not be solved by institutional changes that ignore the nature of women. Structural processes at this point require efficient and sustainable transitions. The results of the study examining the social position of women in the Eastern Black Sea Region show that, as of 2011, although the number of men graduated from any higher education institution in the Eastern Black Sea region is 104015, it falls to 65951 in females. When the genders are compared in terms of literacy rates, which are accepted as basic education in the Eastern Black Sea, it is seen that the situation is remarkable. The number of literate people among men is five times that of women. In the Eastern Black Sea region, 83% of the illiterate population is women (Gazioğlu, 2014). Similar results are achieved in a different study in which the social status of women in the Southeastern Anatolia Region is assessed. In the Southeastern Anatolia Region, the rate of men with primary education is 61.8%, while the rate of women is 22.3%. Another important point of this research is the answers given by the families whether they plan to provide education to their children after primary education where they can afford. Despite the fact that 94.3% of the families are planning to provide education to their sons, there is a decrease in the willingness of families to provide education to their daughters after primary school. The rate of families who plan to provide education to their daughters after primary education is 71.8% (Ökten, 2009). The most important point that draws attention in the study conducted in the Eastern Black Sea Region is the closure of the difference between men and women in higher education. The study conducted by Gürses and Adar on second university students enrolled in Open Education System in 2013 produces similar results. The educational level is determinative in the social position of women and men. It is observed that the inequality of women and men approaches to sameness as the educational level increases. Within this framework, the importance of education in formation of identity of woman is undoubtedly seen. The distance education system also seems important with the effect on the schooling rates during the transformation of the women. Studies related to the distance education system abroad also define the distance education as an important system in the multiple roles of women in social life and in the time and space spared for education. Studies that show that women need a feminine model in education, especially in the context of women's multitasks, point out a linear time in the public space in the face-to-face education system. This linear time is a masculine one. (Kramarea, 2003; Raddon, 2007)

The findings of Kazemi's study accompanied by distance education students who study at Payame Noor University in Iran in 2003 indicate that the rate of women is 57.5% and the rate of men is 42.5%. The study stating that distance education has many advantages on women in Iran, a developing country, especially on those living in rural areas and small villages, draws attention to the importance of the distance education in access of women to education, considering the time and space barriers. However, an important point to note is that women who study in distance education continue to study in the departments, which are traditionally regarded as women's fields (Demiray, 2013)

The barriers in front of women's education are also observed in the interview records of a different study which researches the metaphorical perceptions of active students enrolled in the Open Education System. In face-to-face interviews conducted in the Black Sea Region and the Mediterranean Region, women stated that the Open Education System gave

them a chance to study at university, but it is also important that it shows the fact that the duties in socio-cultural structure and family is the most important barrier for education.²

Black Sea Region – RİZE

E. P. 1st-Year Student of Sociology Department, married with 2 children

"... My father was my conservative. He did not support education for girls. People in our region did not support education for girls. Everybody in the village imitated each other and they did not provide education for their daughters. So, I could not study. I graduated from primary school. Then, it is a dream for me... A dream of 22 years... I am not 34... First, I graduated from secondary school and then high school in 2.5 years. I made an effort. "I will study" I said. I had gone to bed and got up with this dream for 22 years. "I will study someday" I said...I still say so. I will study a lot. It is a start for me, I will study. I always study at home. I do love books. I do love reading. I was reading every book I found before I start studying. To the calendar pages... They are the hours I enjoy... I have to children; since I am a mother, a big part of my day is spent in kitchen. I have a table in the kitchen. I have books and computer on it. I care with my children as well as I study. Studying makes me happy. When I touched the books, I enjoy the smell of them. In other words, I say "In fact, I am a student; I imagine that love.It is a dream I have in my heart. I suppose it would be a burden for my heart if it had been just a dream. I thank Anadolu University very much. For they realized a dream... It is not a dream but a fact now."

G.K. 4th Year-Student of Hospitality Management Department, Married

"I am artisan, I'm interested in politics, and I work in a driving course. I regarded myself inadequate there and I thought that I had many insufficiencies. That's why I chose this department... I am an artisan and a mother. I studies after 11 p.m.. I am 41, there is no age limit for studying; if it was up to me, I would read much more, I have many insufficiencies..."

TRABZON

E. A. Z. 3rd Year-Student of Public Administration Department, teacher, married with 2 children

"..... I love reading. They said "Don't you have a job to do? Why do you read? You have already got your job..." But, I do love reading. But, I adore reading. I find myself when I read. So, I feel happy. I take and pass exams and when I achieve that success, it makes me feel happy. I think it won't be the last; I will continue. That's because I do love learning. I am also post-graduate student.

.....That's because it gives people a brand new world and horizon; it is very important for dozens of people. That's because, only the people in it can notice it. Really, for the people who could not have made their dreams come true, studying at university is a brand new world...a brand new horizon..."

² Interviews were conducted in 2006 in Black Sea and Mediterranean Regions within the scope of award ceremony for the successful students in Open Education Faculty.

ORDU

Y.K. 4th Year-Student of Faculty of Economics – Labor Economy and Industrial Relations, human resources specialist.

"I couldn't have had opportunity to study due to financial impossibilities and I started to work at an early age. I thought how I could develop the work I do now. Then, I determined my targets, ideals, and aims. And I chose a department for me. I am also a human resources specialist. I want to be a good director. It is necessary to know human and the work one does to be a good director. Thus, I preferred to start from Labor Economics. I targeted to complete it in the best way possible and imposed it to my job."

Ö. K. 4th-Year Student of Department of Health Facilities Management, married with 3 children

".... I really worked under very tough circumstances. I have 3 sons. I have a job. I have many responsibilities. I believe in this: To be successful, it is necessary to desire and make effort. I learnt this well. For my children, to reach a position, to show that it is not late for anything; I believe that Open Education will take me to some position in my career, I am going to further study...other departments as well..."

GİRESUN

D. S. 2nd Year-Student of Human Resources Management, computer teacher

"...Open Education gave me an opportunity. I could not study since I worked. I have studied a new department as well as I have improved myself owing to the courses; There are a lot of courses that I like, thus I plan to continue. I plan to complete it to 4 years..."

.... "Everybody can access the information easily from everywhere and depending on their own capacity; it is like those who swim well go further away in the sea but those who can't stay behind the shore,..."

S.S. 2nd Year-Student of Health Management, nurse, married with child.

"....I set my studying conditions on my own. I studied at night shifts and after going off the work. In fact, everyone started calling me nerd. I studied even in tea breaks. I studied for 3 hours everyday in kitchen at home. I did not hinder my social life, though. The only necessary thing is to study and not to sleep much."

T. K. 2nd Year-Student of Sociology, Housewife, 2 children

"...Open Education is rescue boat for us. After having graduated from high school, I could not get further education due to political reasons, as I was wearing headscarf at the time, but this provided me an opportunity. Even if that barrier is removed, one has set his route in his life and started a new order. One cannot afford formal education again. That's because his children have a certain life. One cannot have the luxury for formal education again. But, I continued my daily routines when studying Open Education. I has been like a gift to me. I'm very happy. Thank you, You made my success visible."

RİZE

H. K. 1st Year-Student Department of Nursing for Old Persons, single, working.

"Women here wear scarves. People here are conservative. They do not generally provide education for girls. However, I study owing to the Open Education. I consider it like the Sun. It holds light to my career, I study and work at the same time. It eases the life of student with all its facilities."

MEDITERRANEAN REGION - BURDUR

M. B. 1st Year-Student of Department of Public Administration, visually impaired

"First of all, it gives equal opportunity to people. We can also be described as disadvantaged group. It gives education opportunities to people who do not always have the opportunity to go to school because of equal opportunities. It can be seen as a plus for us It is like sea for me.. I add every piece of knowledge I gather from it into my chest of knowledge, and believe that I improve myself that way. I'll try to obtain as much as I possibly can. After that I want to start post-graduate program. If not, I can study at another department from AÖF (Open Education Faculty). I want to continue learning lifelong."

ANTALYA

H.O. Last Year-Student of Theology Department, married with 1 child

".... For me, it is a very important institution that enables me to get back the facilities already taken away from me. Open education is like the sun dawning late. My career target is to take DGS (External Transfer Exam) after being graduated from university and to complete it to 3-4 years, and to become a good employee...In fact, I started to study after I got married. My spouse encouraged me. I also graduated from high school later. I was high school graduate when I gave birth to my daughter...She, too, did not disappoint me. When I studies, she said "Study, mom...Or your teachers would be mad at you". She is very happy to be here. She says "Mom studied and succeeded..." At home. Thus, it is very good feeling to manage both at the same time.."

Ü.B. 3rd Year-Student of Sociology, married with 2 children

"I have 2 sons. I have a special child at the age of 20. We have very tough days... I look at the back side of the paramount instead of seeing its top. I say it is the road to success. I stop at nothing. They must know how to deal with a minor problem when they face it.

..... There has been a inner voice for 20 years, my purpose has been to stop it and I think I have become an example to my children."

Different studies on the distance education system reveal that the system is important for women's access to education. However, studies conducted show that women are equipped with masculine content at the point of accessing learning processes, which shows that women are reproduced in social life. The study by Cragg, Andrusyszyn, and Fraser shows that the independent study structure of distance education, easy access and distance education encourages life-long learning while reducing the daily stress of women. (Cragg & Andrusyszyn &Fraser, 2005)

Although the distance education system is accepted as an important building stone of the social identity of women, the most important question to be answered within this study is the construction of which other. Although there is no a significant relationship between social gender and career development, income growth, family life variables of women studying at secondary university, different studies show that for women in different socio-cultural structures who have not had access to higher education, the problem remains with the whole reality. The issue that needs to be emphasized at this point is the difference of the other in the identity of the women marginalized. Within the framework of the difference of the other, social gender discussions need to be examined.

Structuralist social gender

In Levi-Strauss Elementary Structures of Kinship, social gender works to position woman and man enabling certain sexual exchanges, to ensure reproduction, to secure certain sexual bonds, and to forbid other types of sexual bonds. In this context, the social gender of the person is defined as the index of prohibited and imposed sexual relations in which the subject is socially organized and produced. (Butler, 2009)

Sherry Ortner, in whom Levi Strauss's effects are evident, seems to have benefited from Strauss's work in order to explain universal secondaryness of women and integrate structuralist assumptions with the ideas of Simon de Beauvoir. (Özbudun& Şafak, 2005)

Simon de Beauvoir examines what makes women into women in the Second Sex from a historical, sociological, anthropological and psychological point of view. The philosophical argument behind these interdisciplinary writings is based on the concept of exceptionalism and the separation made within this concept. (Direk, 2009) According to Beauvoir, there is no reciprocal relationship between men and women throughout history. That is because women were not only established in the patriarchy but also as the other in the matriarchy that preceded it. At the basis of Beauvoir's influence on other feminist writers, such as Ortner, lies the focus on the role of women in the subordinating of Western categories, such as women/men and self/others. (Özbudun & Şafak, 2005)

According to structuralist theories, form determines the action, so society does the individual. According to that assumption society takes place as a fact outside the individual and produces the individual. When the structuralist theories based on bilateral oppositions continue to be examined in this context, the study of "Family Structure and Feminine Personality" by Nancy Chodorow influenced by Freud from the sociological point of view is remarkable. Chodorow, like Ortner, also bases on the assumption of universality of sexual asymmetry, which is subordinate the women, but it deals with it in a psychoanalytic framework. (Chodorow, 2012)

While assuming a history and a culture-extreme duality implies that women's positions do not change throughout history, nor do they differ between themselves, beyond its western-centric extensions, this approach monotonizes the reality of women, mystifying it by embedding in an abstract generality instead of explaining this reality. It is not really necessary to be a third-worlder, black or post-modernist to contest this plain logic. With this view, women become members of a (private) area that is not structured in itself. In the circumstances, the commonness of women's lives are exaggerated, and little is needed

to arrive at the illusion of a woman's solidarity based on sameness or similarity, which marks the first half of the 70's.(Savran, 2002)

Post-structuralist social gender

When post-structuralist gender theories are examined, Judith Butler sees "we" as a vague concept. Butler's "we" is the construction of inner complexity and indeterminism. A definition of "we" that excludes a part of the base and which claims to represent the exclusion is made. According to Butler, who made an assessment through identity policies, it is assumed that there is no need for a maker behind what is made and that the maker is constructed in a variable form through and in what is made. Unlike existential theory, it is the construction of selfdom and actions that change discretely within each other and with each other. (Butler, 2005)

The most important contribution of post-structuralist theories to social gender is the system of discourse-power relations and multiplicity. Looking at Foucault from that point of view, it is necessary to expose multiple productions of discourse about sexuality in the context of plural and moving power relations, rather than being connected to the single form of power. (Foucault, 2010)

According to Alozie et al. (2003), scientists with different views on human development have reached consensus on three main issues. In countries with a multicultural structure, such as the United States of America in the first place, the orientation and behavior of the children socialized by various cultural patterns shall not be similar. Secondly, racial and ethnic subcultures convey socially different belief systems to their members. Thirdly, belief systems allows for the regulation of the majority of early socialization in childhood by environment. (Güldü & Kart, 2009)

When it comes to gender-based education it is seen that it is difficult to make a single woman and we definition for women marginalized. Different others are reproduced in the social system.

Research Question of the Study

In this study, successful students studying at Anadolu University Open Education Faculty will be evaluated in terms of social gender and the department at which they study and relationship of gender, the department at which they study, and geographical - cultural region. The purpose of the study is to show whether the definition of "we" can be made for women having education in distance education system and to determine whether distance education system is a source for reproduction of women under their areas of profession.

Method

The fixed data obtained within the scope of the study in which the students studying in the Open Education System are evaluated in terms of gender based on the program they are enrolled and the region they live in are analyzed and interpreted using the "SPSS for Windows 22.0" software. The parameters used in the research are gender, region and department. Comparisons of gender and department, gender and region and gender by regions were made by chi-square analysis. Within the framework of study in which the variables of gender and region are assessed in terms of selection of department and program of successful students enrolled in Open Education System, Chi-Square Analysis is regarded important in assessment of these variables. In terms of answering the questions

of whether there are significant difference between social gender and department selection and whether social gender cause regional differences in department selection, Chi-Square Analysis is a statistical method looking for answer for these questions. For the frequency in each section of Chi-Square contingency tables to be under 20 in general table, the section frequency of which is less than 5 was kept out of scope. The data were arranged on the number of 125444 successful students and all the analyzes were conducted with 125418 data.

Frequency distributions

Descriptive statistics related to the demographic characteristics of active students enrolled in Open Education System in the study are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of students participated in the study (n=125.418)

Sex	n	%
Female	58.080	46.3
Male	67.338	53.7
Region		
Marmara Region	40.318	32.1
Central Anatolia	29.702	23.7
Aegean Region	15.029	12
Mediterranean Region	13.737	11
Black Sea Region	10.796	8.6
Eastern Anatolia Region	7.905	6.3
Southeast Anatolia Region	7.457	5.9
Abroad	474	4
Department		
Public Administration	21.022	16.8
Business Administration	20.342	16.2
Justice	14.374	11.5
Theology	13.004	10.4
Sociology	9.068	7.2
Social Services	7.677	6.1
International Relations	6.025	4.8
Hospitalization Management	3.777	3
Health Facilities Management	3.302	2.6
Labor Economics and Industrial Relations	2.685	2.1
Finance	2.584	2.1
Turkish Language and Literature	2.273	1.8
Economics	2.189	1.7
Department of Public Relations and		
Publicity	1.496	1.2
Laboratory Worker and Veterinary	1.255	1
Health		
History	1.167	0.9
Photography and Shooting	981	0.8
Philosophy	869	0.7
Property and Property Management	746	0.6
Human Resources Management	753	0.6
Foreign Trade	688	0.5
Business Administration	626	0.5
Agriculture	615	0.5
Banking and Insurance	451	0.4
Child Development	495	0.4
Electric Power Generation, Transmission, and Distribution	534	0.4
Logistics	516	0.4
Brand Relations	460	0.4
Domestic Economy	387	0.3
Media and Communication	401	0.3
Accounting and Tax Practices	419	0.3
Sports Management	389	0.3
Medical Documentation and Secretariat	366	0.3
Office Management and Assistant Management	272	0.2
Public Relations and Advertising	196	0.2
Cultural Heritage and Tourism	214	0.2
Securities and Capital Market	203	0.2
Radio and Television Programming	308	0.2

Table 1 (Continued)

Health Management	302	0.2
Social Service	198	0.2
Care for Old Persons	258	0.2
Local Administrations	254	0.2
Cookery	94	0.1
Call center Services	84	0.1
Aviation Management	91	0.1
English Teaching	77	0.1
Pre School Teaching	97	0.1
Private Security and Guard	151	0.1
Retail Sales and Store Management	136	0.1
Tourism and Hotel Management	166	0.1
Tourism and Traveling Services	92	0.1
International Trade and Logistics Management	77	0.1
Management Informatics Systems	118	0.1
Air Forces Occupation Education	11	0.0
Primary School Social Studies Teaching	6	0.0
Gendarme Professional Education	20	0.0
Land Forces Occupation Education	10	0.0
Police Professional Education	25	0.0
Social Sciences	22	0.0

According to this table, there are 58.080 (53.7%) male and 67.338 (46.3%) female students in the study. Most students enrolled in AÖF are in the Marmara Region with 32.1%. It is followed by Central Anatolia Region with 23.7%, Aegean Region with 12%, Mediterranean Region with 11%, Black Sea Region with 8.6%, Eastern Anatolia Region with 6.3% and Southeast Anatolia Region with 5.9%. According to the region, the minimum student enrollment is in abroad with 0.4%. Moreover, according to the data in this table, it is seen that the students preferred the Department of Public Administration (16.80%) most. Following the Public Administration Department, it is seen that Business Administration is at the second place (16.20%), Justice is at the third place (11.5%), Theology is at the fourth place (10.40%), and Sociology is at the fifth place (7.20%). Besides these departments, among the 60 most preferred departments, there are respectively the Social Services Department, International Relations Department, Hospitality Management Department, Health Facilities Management, Labor Economics and Industrial Relations Departments.

Findings

The statistics on gender comparisons according to the regions where the students in the study are enrolled in Open Education System are given in Table 2. According to this table, there is a significant difference between the regions where the students are enrolled and their gender ($\chi^2=670,30$, $p<.001$). According to these findings, it can be said that the genders vary by the regions where the students are enrolled in the Open Education System.

Table 2. Comparison of genders by regions (n=125.418)

Region	Sex				n	χ^2	p
	Female		Male				
	n	%	n	%			
Mediterranean Region	6.291	45.8	7.448	54.2	13.739		
Eastern Anatolia Region	2.826	35.7	5.079	64.3	7.905		
Aegean Region	7.253	48.2	7.781	51.8	15.034		
Southeast Anatolia Region	2.859	38.3	4.600	61.7	7.459		
Central Anatolia	14.372	48.4	15.332	51.6	29.704	670.30	.000***
Black Sea Region	4.926	45.6	5.872	54.4	10.798		
Marmara Region	19.316	47.9	21.015	52.1	40.331		
Abroad	247	52.1	227	47.9	474		
Total	58.080	46.3	67.338	53.7	125.418		

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$ *** $p<.001$

According to the data in the table, students in Mediterranean Region are males with 54.2% and females with 45.8%; students in Eastern Anatolia Region are males with 64.3% and females with 35.7%; students in Aegean Regions are males with 51.8% and females with 48.2%; students in Southeast Anatolia Region are males with 61.7% and females with 38.3%; students in Central Anatolia are males with 51.6% and females with 48.4%; students in Black Sea Region are males with 54.4% and females with 45.6%; students in Marmara Region are males with 52.1% and females with 47.9%; and students in abroad are males with 47.9% and females with 52.1%.

The statistics on gender comparisons according to the departments where the students in the study are enrolled in Open Education System are given in Table 3. According to this table, there is a significant difference between the departments where the students are enrolled and their gender ($\chi^2=16456.28$, $p<.001$).

Table 3. Comparison of genders by departments (n=125.418)

Departments	Sex				n	χ^2	p
	Female		Male				
	n	%	n	%			
Justice	4.441	30.9	9.933	69.1	14.374		
Cookery	59	62.8	35	37.2	94		
Banking and Insurance	217	48.1	234	51.9	451		
Office Management and Assistant Management	178	65.4	94	34.6	272		
Call center Services	60	71.4	24	28.6	84		
Labor Economics and Industrial Relations	1.283	47.8	1.402	52.2	2.685		
Child Development	482	97.4	13	2.6	495		
Foreign Trade	311	45.2	377	54.8	688		
Electric Power Production, Transmission, and Property and Property Management	46	8.6	488	91.4	534		
Domestic Economy	175	23.5	571	76.5	746		
Philosophy	155	40.1	232	59.9	387		
Photography and Shooting	405	46.6	464	53.4	869		
Photography and Shooting	437	44.5	544	55.5	981		
Public Relations and Advertising	92	46.9	104	53.1	196		
Department of Public Relations and Publicity	743	49.7	753	50.3	1496		
Aviation Management	27	29.7	64	70.3	91		
Economics	847	38.7	1.342	61.3	2189		
Theology	9.62	74	3.384	26	13.004		
English Teaching	57	74	20	26	77		
Human Resources Management	522	69.3	231	30.7	753		
Business Administration	8.080	39.7	12.262	60.3	20.342		
Business Administration	320	51.1	306	48.9	626		
Gendarme Professional Education	0	0.0	20	10	20		
Public Administration	5.791	27.5	15.231	72.5	21.022		
Hospitalization Management	904	23.9	2.873	76.1	3777		
Cultural Heritage and Tourism	151	70.6	63	29.4	214		
Laboratory Worker and Veterinary Health	871	69.4	384	30.6	1255		
Logistics	207	40.1	309	59.9	516		
Finance	1.433	55.5	1.151	44.5	2.584		
Brand Relations	287	62.4	173	37.6	460	16456.28	.000***
Media and Communication	215	53.6	186	46.4	401		
Securities and Capital Market	57	28.1	146	71.9	203		
Accounting and Tax Practices	237	56.6	182	43.4	419		
Pre School Teaching	97	100	0	0.0	97		
Private Security and Guard	6	4	145	96	151		
Retail Sales and Store Management	38	27.9	98	72.1	136		
Police Professional Education	2	8	23	92	25		
Radio and Television Programming	173	56.2	135	43.8	308		
Health Facilities Management	2.231	67.6	1.071	32.4	3.302		

Table 3 (Continued)

Health Management	193	63.9	109	36.1	302
Social Sciences	8	36.4	14	63.6	22
Social Service	131	66.2	67	33.8	198
Social Services	6.101	79.5	1.576	20.5	7.677
Sociology	5.591	61.7	3.477	38.3	9.068
Sports Management	89	22.9	300	77.1	389
Agriculture	208	33.8	407	66.2	615
History	386	33.1	781	66.9	1167
Medical Documentation and Secretariat	284	77.6	82	22.4	366
Tourism and Hotel Management	72	43.4	94	56.6	166
Tourism and Traveling Services	48	52.2	44	47.8	92
Turkish Language and Literature	1.746	76.8	527	23.2	2.273
International Relations	1.658	27.5	4.367	72.5	6.025
International Trade and Logistics Management	22	28.6	55	71.4	77
Care for Old Persons	185	71.7	73	28.3	258
Local Administrations	63	24.8	191	75.2	254
Management Informatics Systems	37	31.4	81	68.6	118

*p<.05, **p<.01 ***p<.001

According to these findings, it can be said that the genders vary by the departments in which the students are enrolled. According to the data in the table, the distributions of the ten departments that students enrolled in the study most are respectively as follows: 21,022 Public Administration Department students consist of 5,791 females (27.5%) and 15,231 males (72.5%); 20,342 Business Administration Department students consist of 8,080 females (39.7%) and 12,262 males (60.3%), 14,374 Justice Department students consist of 4,441 females (30.9%) and 9,933 males (69.1%), 13,004 Theology Department students consist of 9,620 females (74%) and 3,384 males (26%), 9,068 Sociology Department students consist of 5,591 females (61.7%) and 3,477 males (38.3%), 7,677 Social Services Department students consist of 6,101 females (79.5%) and 1,576 males (20.5%), 6,025 International Relations Department students consist of 1,658 females (27.5%) and 4,367 males (72.5%), 3,777 Hospitalization Management Department students consist of 904 females (23.9%) and 2,873 males (76.1%), 3,302 Health Facilities Management Department students consist of 2,231 females (67.6%) and 1,071 (32.4%), and Labor Economics and Industrial Relations Department students consist of 1,283 females (47.8%) and 1,402 males (52.2%)

The statistics on comparisons of the departments where the students in the study are enrolled in Open Education System and their regions are given in Table 4. According to this table, there is a significant difference between the departments of the students and their regions ($\chi^2=4543.12$, $p<.001$). According to these findings, it can be said that the departments vary by the regions where the students are enrolled.

Table 4. Comparison of regions by departments (n=125.418)

Departments	Regions								χ^2	p
	AK	D A	EGE	GA	İA	KD	MB	YD		
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Justice	10.3	7.5	9.9	7.4	29.8	6.5	28.3	0.222	4543.12	.000***
Cookery	18.1	5.3	5.3	11.7	22.3	11.7	25.5	0.0		
Banking and Insurance	9.5	3.1	14.2	2.7	19.5	7.8	42.6	0.7		
Office Management and Assistant	11	5.5	11.8	3.7	34.9	8.8	24.3	0.0		
Call center Services	38.1	6	9.5	9.5	17.9	2.4	16.7	0.0		
Labor Economics and Industrial	9	4.1	14.1	3.4	19.7	8.3	41.1	0.3		
Child Development	12.1	4.8	11.7	5.9	27.3	7.3	30.9	0.0		
Foreign Trade	7.8	0.6	15.4	0.9	19.6	4.7	50.9	0.1		
Electric Power Production,	9.7	4.3	12.4	3.6	26.8	5.6	37.6	0.0		

Table 4 (Continued)

Property and Property	8.7	2.8	14.7	2.1	18.2	4.2	48.7	0.5
Domestic Economy	9.6	3.1	23	2.6	27.6	9	24	1
Philosophy	10.4	4.7	15.7	5.2	17.8	8.1	37.3	0.9
Photography and Shooting	8.9	1.4	17.2	2.2	23	5.4	40.6	1.2
Public Relations and Advertising	8.2	3.1	14.3	2	22.4	6.6	42.9	0.5
Department of Public Relations and	8	2.5	12.3	1.7	23.7	7.1	43.4	1.5
Air Forces Occupation Education	9.1	27.3	9.1	9.1	45.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Aviation Management	13.2	2.2	12.1	4.4	37.4	3.3	27.5	0.0
Economics	8.1	4.6	13.3	3.7	27.7	6.4	35.8	0.4
Theology	10.3	8	8.2	9.3	23.1	9.2	31.9	0.1
English Teaching	9.1	2.6	15.6	1.3	45.5	7.8	18.2	0.0
Human Resources Management	7.3	1.7	11.4	2	22	5.6	49.1	0.8
Business Administration	10.4	4.1	12.7	3.8	20	6.7	42.1	0.4
Business Administration	8.3	1.8	12.6	2.6	19.8	6.1	47.8	1.1
Gendarme Professional Education	10	15	5	25	10	20	15	0.0
Public Administration	11.7	8.8	11.8	6.3	24.5	10.9	25.5	0.5
Hospitalization Management	17	5.7	13.4	2.6	24.8	9.6	26.7	0.3
Cultural Heritage and Tourism	7	2.3	10.3	1.4	19.2	7	52.3	0.5
Laboratory Worker and Veterinary	11.7	7.3	14.8	5.9	23.1	11.3	25.7	0.2
Logistics	6	2.5	20.2	1.9	16.1	4.5	48.6	0.2
Finance	11.2	5	13.7	6.3	23.8	9.3	30.4	0.2
Brand Relations	7.6	1.1	11.7	0.9	18.9	2.4	57.2	0.2
Media and Communication	6.2	2.5	12.2	2.2	24.7	5	45.9	1.2
Securities and Capital Market	8.4	3.4	12.8	1.5	16.3	5.4	51.2	1
Accounting and Taxation Practices	7.6	1.9	15	2.9	22	5.5	42.7	2.4
Pre School Teaching	19.6	9.3	10.3	5.2	13.4	12.4	29.9	0.0
Private Security and Guard	13.2	2.6	13.2	6.6	21.9	8.6	33.8	0.0
Retail Sales and Store Management	11	0.7	12.5	0.7	14	4.4	55.9	0.7
Police Professional Education	8	4	12	0.0	32	20	24	0.0
Radio and Television Programming	5.2	3.2	11.7	1.9	32.8	3.9	41.2	0.0
Health Facilities Management	11.4	5	15.1	4.7	24.2	10.1	29.1	0.3
Health Management	13.2	9.6	14.9	6.3	18.9	8.9	28.1	0.0
Social Sciences	9.1	4.5	13.6	0.0	22.7	9.1	40.9	0.0
Social Service	11.6	9.6	10.6	15.7	19.2	16.7	16.7	0.0
Social Services	12.9	7.6	12.8	7.2	25.3	11.8	22.3	0.1
Sociology	12.8	6.6	12.6	8.8	22.3	9.3	26.9	0.6
Sports Management	7.2	4.9	11.8	4.4	18.8	8.7	43.2	1
Agriculture	12.8	5.9	11.5	10.2	27.3	8.1	23.6	0.5
History	11.7	4.1	11.4	4.6	20.8	11.7	35.1	0.5
Medical Documentation	16.1	12.8	12.3	9	24.3	8.7	16.7	0.0
Tourism and Hotel Management	13.3	1.2	18.1	1.2	13.3	7.2	45.2	0.6
Tourism and Traveling Services	8.7	0.0	18.5	0.0	13	4.3	53.3	2.2
Turkish Language and Literature	12	6.7	10.5	6.5	20.5	10.6	33	0.2
International Relations	8.8	6	12.3	5.2	25.1	7.7	34.3	0.5
International Trade and Logistics	3.9	1.3	13	7.8	16.9	3.9	53.2	0.0
Care for Old Persons	13.2	12	9.7	15.1	21.7	14	14.3	0.0
Local Administrations	7.1	9.1	12.2	5.9	18.5	8.3	34.6	4.3
Management Informatics Systems	6.8	4.2	14.4	4.2	22.9	5.9	41.5	0.0

*p<.05, **p<.01 ***p<.001 AC: Mediterranean Region, DA: Eastern Anatolia Region, EGE: Aegean Region, GA: Southeast Anatolia Region, İA: Central Anatolia, KD: Black Sea Region, MB: Marmara Region YD: Abroad

According to the data in the table, the distributions of the five departments that students enrolled in the study most are respectively as follows: 21,022 Public Administration students are from 11.7% Mediterranean, 8.8% Eastern Anatolia, 11.8% Aegean, 6.3% Southeast Anatolia, 24.5% Central Anatolia, 10.9% Black Sea, 25.5% Marmara, and 5% abroad; 20,342 Business Administration students are from 10.4% Mediterranean, 4.1%

Eastern Anatolia, 12.7% Aegean, 3.8% Southeast Anatolia, 20% Central Anatolia, 6.7% Black Sea, 42.1% Marmara, and 4% abroad; 14,374 Justice students are from 10.3% Mediterranean, 7.5% Eastern Anatolia, 9.9% Aegean, 7.4% Southeast Anatolia, 29.8% Central Anatolia, 6.5% Black Sea, 28.3% Marmara, and 2% abroad; 13,004 Theology students are from 10.3% Mediterranean, 8% Eastern Anatolia, 8.2% Aegean, 9.3% Southeast Anatolia, 23.1% Central Anatolia, 9.2% Black Sea, 31.9% Marmara, and 1% abroad; and 9,068 Sociology students are from 12.8% Mediterranean, 6.6% Eastern Anatolia, 12.6% Aegean, 8.8% Southeast Anatolia, 22.3% Central Anatolia, 9.3% Black Sea, 26.9% Marmara, and 6% abroad.

Table 5. Differentiation of gender in regions by departments in which the students are enrolled (1)

Department	Sex	REGION														Total		χ^2 ($\chi^2_{(b)}$)	P (P ^v)
		MEDITERRANEAN		EASTERN ANATOLIA		EGE		SOUTHEASTERN ANATOLIA		CENTRAL ANATOLIA		BLACK SEA		MARMARA					
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Justice	Female	478	32.3	206	19.0	497	34.8	212	19.9	1.461	34.2	266	28.3	1.318	32.4	4.438	30.9	172.512	.000***
	Male	1.000	67.7	877	81.0	931	65.2	856	80.1	2.817	65.8	675	71.7	2.754	67.6	9.910	69.1		
Cookery	Female	9	52.9	1	20	3	60	7	63.6	14	66.7	7	63.6	18	75	59	62.8	6.312	0.389 (0.390)
	Male	8	47.1	4	80	2	40	4	36.4	7	33.3	4	36.4	6	25	35	37.2		
Banking and Insurance	Female	23	53.5	5	35.7	34	53.1	5	41.7	35	39.8	17	48.6	98	51	217	48.4	5.297	0.506
	Male	20	46.5	9	64.3	30	46.9	7	58.3	53	60.2	18	51.4	94	49	231	51.6		
Office Management and Assistant	Female	20	66.7	4	26.7	17	53.1	8	80	72	75.8	16	66.7	41	62.1	178	65.4	17.911	.006**
	Male	10	33.3	11	73.3	15	46.9	2	20	23	24.2	8	33.3	25	37.9	94	34.6		
Call center Services	Female	23	71.9	1	20	6	75	5	62.5	13	86.7	2	100	10	71.4	60	71.4	9.352	0.155 (0.154)
	Male	9	28.1	4	80	2	25	3	37.5	2	13.3	0	0.0	4	28.6	24	28.6		
Labor Economics and Industrial	Female	110	45.5	37	33.6	173	45.6	33	36.7	236	44.6	91	40.8	599	54.3	1.279	47.8	39.527 ^b	.000**
	Male	132	54.5	73	66.4	206	54.4	57	63.3	293	55.4	132	59.2	505	45.7	1.398	52.2		
Foreign Trade	Female	17	31.5	1	25	60	56.6	1	16.7	72	53.3	12	37.5	148	42.3	311	45.3	17.865 (18.226)	0.007 (.006**)
	Male	37	68.5	3	75	46	43.4	5	83.3	63	46.7	20	62.5	202	57.7	376	54.7		
Electric Power Production, Transmission,	Female	2	3.8	2	8.7	3	4.5	2	10.5	12	8.4	5	16.7	20	10	46	8.6	5.914 (6.030)	0.433 (0.420)
	Male	50	96.2	21	91.3	63	95.5	17	89.5	131	91.6	25	83.3	181	90	488	91.4		
Property And Property Management	Female	12	18.5	1	4.8	26	23.6	1	6.3	36	26.5	6	19.4	91	25.1	173	23.3	9.166	0.164
	Male	53	81.5	20	95.2	84	76.4	15	93.8	100	73.5	25	80.6	272	74.9	569	76.7		
Domestic Economy	Female	9	24.3	2	16.7	36	40.4	4	40	48	44.9	15	42.9	37	39.8	151	39.4	7.677	0.263
	Male	28	75.7	10	83.3	53	59.6	6	60	59	55.1	20	57.1	56	60.2	232	60.6		
Philosophy	Female	53	58.9	12	29.3	73	53.7	8	17.8	73	47.1	37	52.9	144	44.4	400	46.5	29.897	.000**
	Male	37	41.1	29	70.7	63	46.3	37	82.2	82	52.9	33	47.1	180	55.6	461	53.5		
Photography and Shooting	Female	34	39.1	4	28.6	80	47.3	6	27.3	105	46.5	22	41.5	177	44.5	428	44.2	6.177	0.404
	Male	53	60.9	10	71.4	89	52.7	16	72.7	121	53.5	31	58.5	221	55.5	541	55.8		
Public Relations and Advertising	Female	11	68.8	4	66.7	10	35.7	2	50	19	43.2	6	46.2	39	46.4	91	46.7	5.685 (5.763)	0.459 (0.450)
	Male	5	31.3	2	33.3	18	64.3	2	50	25	56.8	7	53.8	45	53.6	104	53.3		
Department of Public Relations and Publicity	Female	61	51.3	10	27	94	51.1	8	32	179	50.6	43	40.6	335	51.6	730	49.5	15.580	.016*
	Male	58	48.7	27	73	90	48.9	17	68	175	49.4	63	59.4	314	48.4	744	50.5		
Aviation Management	Female	5	41.7	1	50	3	27.3	0	0.0	11	32.4	1	33.3	6	24	27	29.7	3.463 (4.521)	0.749 (0.607)
	Male	7	58.3	1	50	8	72.7	4	100	23	67.6	2	66.7	19	76	64	70.3		
Economics	Female	60	33.7	24	24	130	44.7	24	29.3	241	39.8	46	32.9	318	40.6	843	38.7	21.951	.001**

Table 5. (1) (Continued)

	Male	118	66.3	76	76	161	55.3	58	70.7	365	60.2	94	67.1	465	59.4	1.337	61.3		
Theology	Female	989	74.2	633	61.2	798	75.3	706	58.1	2.387	79.4	858	71.5	3.243	78.2	9.614	74	336.855	.000**
	Male	344	25.8	402	38.8	262	24.7	509	41.9	620	20.6	342	28.5	902	21.8	3.381	26		
English Teaching	Female	4	57.1	1	50	11	91.7	1	100	24	68.6	5	83.3	11	78.6	57	74	4.894 (5.462)	0.558 (0.486)
	Male	3	42.9	1	50	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	31.4	1	16.7	3	21.4	20	26		
Human Resources Management	Female	32	58.2	5	38.5	68	79.1	4	26.7	122	73.5	26	61.9	263	71.1	520	69.6	28.814	.000**
	Male	23	41.8	8	61.5	18	20.9	11	73.3	44	26.5	16	38.1	107	28.9	227	30.4		
Business Administration	Female	805	38.2	208	25	1.084	41.9	244	32	1.663	40.9	511	37.7	3.523	41.2	8.038	39.7	113.203	.000**
	Male	1.302	61.8	623	75	1.505	58.1	519	68	2.399	59.1	843	62.3	5.036	58.8	12.227	60.3		

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ x : likelihood ratio p value, y : likelihood ratio value

Table 5. Differentiation of gender in regions by departments in which the students are enrolled (2)

Department	Sex	REGION														Total		χ^2 (χ^2_{2y})	P (P^x)
		MEDITERRANEAN		EASTERN ANATOLIA		EGE		SOUTHEASTERN ANATOLIA		CENTRAL ANATOLIA		BLACK SEA		MARMARA					
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Business Administration	Female	22	42.3	6	54.5	47	59.5	10	62.5	65	52.4	13	34.2	154	51.5	317	51.2	9.162	0.165
	Male	30	57.7	5	45.5	32	40.5	6	37.5	59	47.6	25	65.8	145	48.5	302	48.8		
Public Administration	Female	686	27.8	334	18	764	30.7	288	21.8	1.506	29.3	595	26	1.567	29.3	5.740	27.4	138.919	.000**
	Male	1.780	72.2	1.524	82	1.723	69.3	1.036	78.2	3.639	70.7	1.694	74	3.784	70.7	15.180	72.6		
Hospitalization Management	Female	117	18.2	34	15.7	140	27.7	21	21.6	224	23.9	72	19.9	291	28.8	899	23.9	40.468	.000**
	Male	525	81.8	183	84.3	365	72.3	76	78.4	712	76.1	289	80.1	718	71.2	2.868	76.1		
Cultural Heritage and Tourism	Female	12	80	2	40	18	81.8	2	66.7	28	68.3	10	66.7	79	70.5	151	70.9	4.485 (4.386)	0.611 (0.625)
	Male	3	20	3	60	4	18.2	1	33.3	13	31.7	5	33.3	33	29.5	62	29.1		
Laboratory Worker and Veterinary	Female	109	74.1	57	62.6	124	66.7	50	67.6	202	69.7	99	69.7	229	70.9	870	69.4	4.652	0.589
	Male	38	25.9	34	37.4	62	33.3	24	32.4	88	30.3	43	30.3	94	29.1	383	30.6		
Logistics	Female	16	51.6	2	15.4	53	51	1	10	37	44.6	9	39.1	89	35.5	207	40.2	16.835	.010*
	Male	15	48.4	11	84.6	51	49	9	90	46	55.4	14	60.9	162	64.5	308	59.8		
Finance	Female	161	55.5	76	58.5	197	55.6	60	37	348	56.5	144	59.8	443	56.4	1.429	55.4	25.098a g	.000**
	Male	129	44.5	54	41.5	157	44.4	102	63	268	43.5	97	40.2	342	43.6	1.149	44.6		

Table 5 (2) (Continued)

Brand Relations	Female	19	54.3	2	40	34	63	3	75	56	64.4	5	45.5	167	63.5	286	62.3	3.949 (3.854)	0.684 (0.696)
	Male	16	45.7	3	60	20	37	1	25	31	35.6	6	54.5	96	36.5	173	37.7		
Media and Communication	Female	13	52	2	20	24	49	3	33.3	55	55.6	4	20	110	59.8	211	53.3	18.499 (19.250)	0.005 (.004**)
	Male	12	48	8	80	25	51	6	66.7	44	44.4	16	80	74	40.2	185	46.7		
Securities and Capital Market	Female	4	23.5	0	0.0	10	38.5	0	0.0	10	30.3	1	9.1	31	29.8	56	27.9	7.697 (10.734)	0.261 (0.097)
	Male	13	76.5	7	100.0	16	61.5	3	100	23	69.7	10	90.9	73	70.2	145	72.1		
Accounting and Taxation Practices	Female	18	56.3	3	37.5	35	55.6	3	25	61	66.3	12	52.2	100	55.9	232	56.7	9.850	0.131
	Male	14	43.8	5	62.5	28	44.4	9	75	31	33.7	11	47.8	79	44.1	177	43.3		
Retail Sales and Store Management	Female	3	20	1	100	7	41.2	0	0.0	4	21.1	0	0.0	23	30.3	38	28.1	7.855 (9.686)	0.249 (0.139)
	Male	12	80	0	0.0	10	58.8	1	100	15	78.9	6	100	53	69.7	97	71.9		
Radio and Television Programming	Female	7	43.8	5	50	19	52.8	4	66.7	64	63.4	6	50	68	53.5	173	56.2	4.260 (4.286)	0.642 (0.638)
	Male	9	56.3	5	50	17	47.2	2	33.3	37	36.6	6	50	59	46.5	135	43.8		
Medical Facilities Management	Female	248	65.6	115	69.3	350	70.1	104	66.7	551	68.9	206	61.9	653	68	2,227	67.6	8.086	0.232
	Male	130	34.4	51	30.7	149	29.9	52	33.3	249	31.1	127	38.1	308	32	1,066	32.4		
Health Management	Female	26	65	16	55.2	29	64.4	8	42.1	45	78.9	18	66.7	51	60	193	63.9	11.143	0.084
	Male	14	35	13	44.8	16	35.6	11	57.9	12	21.1	9	33.3	34	40	109	36.1		
Social Service	Female	13	56.5	11	57.9	16	76.2	18	58.1	27	71.1	25	75.8	21	63.6	131	66.2	5.243	0.513
	Male	10	43.5	8	42.1	5	23.8	13	41.9	11	28.9	8	24.2	12	36.4	67	33.8		
Social Services	Female	776	78.2	403	69.5	798	81.3	349	63.1	1,607	82.7	765	84.3	1,396	81.5	6,094	79.5	159.200	.000**
	Male	216	21.8	177	30.5	184	18.7	204	36.9	336	17.3	142	15.7	316	18.5	1,575	20.5		
Sociology	Female	726	62.7	298	49.6	736	64.3	388	48.4	1,315	64.9	508	60.3	1,580	64.9	5,551	61.6	121.028	.000**
	Male	431	37.3	303	50.4	409	35.7	414	51.6	711	35.1	335	39.7	856	35.1	3,459	38.4		

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ x : likelihood ratio p value, y : likelihood ratio value

Table 5. Differentiation of gender in regions by departments in which the students are enrolled (3)

Department	Sex	REGION														Total		X2 (X2y)	P (Px)
		MEDITERRANEAN		EASTERN ANATOLIA		EGE		SOUTHEASTERN ANATOLIA		CENTRAL ANATOLIA		BLACK SEA		MARMARA					
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
Sports Management	Female	10	35.7	2	10.5	10	21.7	1	5.9	25	34.2	3	8.8	37	22	88	22.9	16.308	.012*
	Male	18	64.3	17	89.5	36	78.3	16	94.1	48	65.8	31	91.2	131	78	297	77.1		
Agriculture	Female	24	30.4	11	30.6	23	32.4	24	38.1	64	38.1	13	26	46	31.7	205	33.5	4.182	0.652
	Male	55	69.6	25	69.4	48	67.6	39	61.9	104	61.9	37	74	99	68.3	407	66.5		
History	Female	40	29.2	17	35.4	46	34.6	12	22.2	85	35	31	22.8	154	37.6	385	33.2	14.657	.023*
	Male	97	70.8	31	64.6	87	65.4	42	77.8	158	65	105	77.2	256	62.4	776	66.8		
Medical Documentations and	Female	47	79.7	33	70.2	38	84.4	23	69.7	70	78.7	24	75	49	80.3	284	77.6	4.460	0.615
	Male	12	20.3	14	29.8	7	15.6	10	30.3	19	21.3	8	25	12	19.7	82	22.4		
Tourism and Hotel Management	Female	9	40.9	0	0.0	17	56.7	0	0.0	8	36.4	4	33.3	34	45.3	72	43.6	6.313 (7.803)	0.389 (0.253)
	Male	13	59.1	2	100	13	43.3	2	100	14	63.6	8	66.7	41	54.7	93	56.4		
Tourism and Traveling Services	Female	3	37.5	0	0.0	12	70.6	0	0.0	7	58.3	1	25	25	51	48	53.3	4.355 (4.477)	0.360 (0.345)
	Male	5	62.5	0	0.0	5	29.4	0	0.0	5	41.7	3	75	24	49	42	46.7		
Turkish Language and Literature	Female	191	70	111	73	189	79.4	97	65.5	383	82.2	170	70.5	601	80	1.742	76.8	37.073	.000**
	Male	82	30	41	27	49	20.6	51	34.5	83	17.8	71	29.5	150	20	527	23.2		
International Relations	Female	122	22.9	70	19.4	204	27.5	48	15.2	480	31.7	112	24.3	612	29.6	1.648	27.5	61.770	.000**
	Male	411	77.1	291	80.6	539	72.5	267	84.8	1.033	68.3	349	75.7	1.457	70.4	4.347	72.5		
International Trade and Logistics	Female	1	33.3	0	0.0	3	30	1	16.7	7	53.8	2	66.7	8	19.5	22	28.6	8.711 (8.454)	0.190 (0.207)
	Male	2	66.7	1	100	7	70	5	83.3	6	46.2	1	33.3	33	80.5	55	71.4		
Care for Old Persons	Female	25	73.5	18	58.1	19	76	26	66.7	43	76.8	27	75	27	73	185	71.7	4.548	0.603
	Male	9	26.5	13	41.9	6	24	13	33.3	13	23.2	9	25	10	27	73	28.3		
Local Administrations	Female	4	22.2	0	0.0	9	29	2	13.3	10	21.3	4	19	27	30.7	56	23	11.485 (16.539)	0.074 (.011*)
	Male	14	77.8	23	100	22	71	13	86.7	37	78.7	17	81	61	69.3	187	77		
Management Informatics Systems	Female	1	12.5	3	60	6	35.3	0	0.0	9	33.3	3	42.9	15	30.6	37	31.4	6.126	0.409
	Male	7	87.5	2	40	11	64.7	5	100	18	66.7	4	57.1	34	69.4	81	68.6		

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$ x : likelihood ratio p value, y : likelihood ratio value

Region and department comparison of students enrolled in Open Education System by genders are given in Table 5. Among the departments having significant difference between genders by regions in which they are enrolled according to the this table are Justice Department ($\chi^2=172.512$, $p<.001$), Office Management and Assistant Management ($\chi^2=17.911$, $p<.01$), Labor Economics and Industrial Relations Department ($\chi^2 = 39.527$, $p <.001$), Department of Foreign Trade ($\chi^2y = 18.226$, $px <.01$), Department of Philosophy ($\chi^2 = 29.897$, $p <.001$), Public Relations and Publicity Department ($\chi^2 = 15.580$, $p <.05$), Department of Economics ($\chi^2 = 21.951$, $p <.01$), Department of Theology ($\chi^2 = 336.855$, $p <.001$), Department of Human Resources Management ($\chi^2 = 28.814$, $p <.001$), Department of Business Administration ($\chi^2 = 113.203$, $p <.001$), Department of Public Administration ($\chi^2=138.919$, $p<.001$), Hospitalization Management ($\chi^2=40.468$, $p<.001$), Logistics Department ($\chi^2 = 16.835$, $p <.05$), Finance Department ($\chi^2 = 25.098$, $p <.001$), Media and Communication ($\chi^{2y}=19.250$, $p^x<.01$), Department of Social Services ($\chi^2 = 159.200$, $p <.001$), Department of Sociology ($\chi^2 = 121.028$, $p <.001$), Department of Sport Management ($\chi^2 = 16.308$, $p <.05$), History Department ($\chi^2 = 14.657$, $p <.05$), Turkish Language and Literature Department ($\chi^2 = 37.073$, $p <.001$), International Relations Department ($\chi^2 = 61.770$, $p <.001$), the Department of Local Administrations ($\chi^2y = 16.539$, $px <.05$). In these departments, the genders of the students vary according by regions.

The departments for which gender variable varies in favor of women are Office Management and Executive Assistance, Theology, Human Resources Management, Finance, Media and Communication, Turkish Language Literature, Social Services, Sociology and History Departments. The departments for which gender variable varies in favor of men are Justice, Labor Economics and Industrial Relations, Foreign Trade, Philosophy, Public Relations and Publicity, Economics, Business Administration, Public Administration, Hospitality Management, Logistics, Sport Management, History, International Relations and Local Governments.

Among the departments which have no significant difference between genders by regions in which they are enrolled are Cookery ($\chi^2=6.312$), Banking and Insurance ($\chi^2 = 5,297$), Call Center Services ($\chi^2 = 9,352$), Electric Power Production, Transmission, and Distribution ($\chi^2y = 6,030$), Real Estate and Property Management ($\chi^2 = 9,166$) Department of Domestic Economy ($\chi^2 = 7.677$), Department of Photography and Shooting ($\chi^2 = 6.177$), Department of Public Relations and Advertising ($\chi^2y = 5.763$), Aviation Management ($\chi^2 = 4.521$), English Language Teaching ($\chi^2 = 5.462$), Business Administration Department ($\chi^2=9.162$), Cultural Heritage and Tourism ($\chi^{2y}=4.386$), Laboratory Worker and Veterinary Health ($\chi^2=4.652$), Brand Relations ($\chi^2y = 3.854$), Securities and Capital Markets Department ($\chi^2 = 10.734$), Accounting and Taxation Practices Department ($\chi^2=9.850$), Retail Sales and Store Management ($\chi^{2y}=9.686$), Radio and Television Programming Department ($\chi^2 = 4.286$), Health Facilities Management Department ($\chi^2 = 8.086$), Health Management Department ($\chi^2 = 11.143$), Social Service ($\chi^2=5.243$), Agriculture ($\chi^2=4.182$), Medical Documentation and Secretariat ($\chi^2=4.460$), Tourism and Hotel Management ($\chi^2y = 7.803$), Tourism and Travel Services ($\chi^2y = 4.477$), International Trade of Logistics Management ($\chi^2 = 8.454$), Department Care for Old Persons ($\chi^2 = 4.548$), Management Informatics Systems ($\chi^2 = 6.126$) ($p>.05$). In these departments, the genders of the students do not vary according by regions.

Conclusion

Within the findings obtained within the scope of the study in which the students studying in the Open Education System are evaluated in terms of gender based on the program they are enrolled and the region they live in, In chi-square analysis, although there were too many changes in percentage in some departments, there was no significant difference. The reason for this is that number of students is not high in the relevant departments and regions.

The departments for which gender variable varies in favor of women are Office Management and Executive Assistance, Theology, Human Resources Management, Finance, Media and Communication, Turkish Language Literature, Social Services, Sociology and History Departments. The departments for which gender variable varies in favor of men are Justice, Labor Economics and Industrial Relations, Foreign Trade, Philosophy, Public Relations and Publicity, Economics, Business Administration, Public Administration, Hospitality Management, Logistics, Sport Management, History, International Relations and Local Governments. When the departments are evaluated in terms of social gender, it is seen that the departments that are accepted as female-specific occupations regenerate the woman's inequality in the social structure. The program that draws attention in the context of findings is the department of theology. When examined by regions, the rate of successful students studying in the department in Mediterranean Region is female students 74.2% and male students 25.8%; in Marmara Region is female students 78.2% and male students 21.8%; in Eastern Anatolia Region is female students 61.8% and male students 38.8% It is the Southeast Anatolia Region where 58.1% of students are female and 41.9% of students are male that the number of females and males are the closest. In the context of findings, it is seen that religion and culture are important in the formation of identity among women. It is the remarkable result of the study that the rates of the male and female students in the Theology Department are close to each other in Southeast Anatolia and Eastern Anatolia Regions on a regional basis. Beyond gender disparity in access to education, the sameness of the regional other is noteworthy.

When the departments of Office Management and Executive Assistance, Theology, Human Resources Management, Finance, Media and Communication, Turkish Language Literature, Social Services, Sociology and History for which gender variable varies in favor of women are assessed, Southeastern Anatolia Region and Central Anatolia Region are the two regions with the highest female rates. Southeast Anatolia Region (Male = 20%, Female = 80%); Central Anatolia Region (Male = 24.2, Female = 75.8) In these regions where patriarchal society structures predominate compared to other regions, Office Management and Executive Assistance departments are regarded as women-specific occupations. The region with the highest female rate in the Human Resources Management is the Aegean Region. In the Aegean Region (Male = 20.9%, Female = 79.1%) while in Southeast Anatolia (Male = 73.3%, Female = 26.7%). In the Finance Department, the region with the lowest female ratio is Southeastern Anatolia Region (Male = 63%, Female = 37%). The Media and Communication department is one of the programs that strikingly show the difference of the other in terms of the results. Eastern Anatolia (Male = 80, Female = 20); Black Sea Region Region (Male = 80, Female = 20); Southeast Anatolia Regions (Male = 67.7, Female = 33.3) are the regions in which women prefer the department least. Existence of more female students in the Mediterranean and Marmara Regions than male

students and an approximate equality in the Aegean Region indicate the importance of socio-cultural structure in career choices.

Similar indicators draw attention when students of the Local Administration Department, for which gender variable is in favor of men, are examined for gender variance by regions. The three regions with the highest change are: Eastern Anatolia Region (Male = 100%, Female = 0%), Southeastern Anatolia Region (Male = 86.7%, Female = 13.3%) and Black Sea Region (Male = 81%, Female = 19%). It can be thought that regional culture is among the causes of the variance and difference in these findings. This study conducted on the axis of social gender shows that the "we" of the woman marginalized creates different we in different regions. This situation, expressed as the difference of the other, is not possible with a point of resistance that opens the way for reproduction. For this reason, necessary precautions should be taken immediately and planned studies should be made in order to ensure equal access to education. Recommendations that can be made from the results obtained in this context can be listed as follows:

- Consideration of the socio-cultural structure of women in the construction of distance education contents, production of micro solutions (educational materials considering the religious and cultural sensitivities of the region)
- For Justice, Labor Economics and Industrial Relations, Foreign Trade, Philosophy, Public Relations and Publicity, Economics, Business Administration, Public Administration, Hospitality Management, Logistics, Sport Management, History, International Relations and Local Governments Department for which gender variable varies in favor of men, using corporate communication tools effectively and efficiently, especially by preparing commercials and promotional films, creating women to be role models,
- While designing content for programs in which the gender variable is in favor of men, the gradual breakdown of social perception based on male-female dual opposition with feminine content designs,
- Designing educational contents in a cyclical sense of time and space, not in a masculine linear time, taking into account the multitasking of women in the social structure Especially in the Eastern and Southeastern Regions, where gender variable is in favor of men, using the traditional communication tools such as television, radio and newspaper efficiently in view of women's access to internet technologies Let us not forget that, tool is message. And control over change does not move with the change, it moves in front of it. For this reason, not only corporate changes but a structural transformation is needed to prevent the control of women's change.

About Authors

Lecturer Dr. Başak Kalkan



Başak Kalkan graduated from Istanbul University, Faculty of Political Sciences, Department of Public Administration in 2002. Kalkan, who was awarded with post-graduate degree in Anadolu University Press and Publication department, was awarded with doctor's degree in department of Journalism of Istanbul University. Kalkan, having work as scenarist in Anadolu University Open Education Faculty Television Production Center since 2010, conducts studies in women's studies, intercultural comparative analysis, discourse analysis, content design in distance education tools and visual communication.

Mail address: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi Televizyon Yapım Merkezi, Yunussemre Kampüsü, Eskişehir, Turkey

Tel (İş): +90 222 335 0580 / 2394

GSM: +90 5442139531

Eposta: badar@anadolu.edu.tr

Asst. Prof. Dr. Gülfem Gürses



Gülfem Gürses graduated from Anadolu University, Faculty of Communication Sciences Department of Cinema and Television in 1991. Kalkan, who was awarded with post-graduate degree in Marmara University Fine Arts Institute Cinema TV department in 1997, was awarded with doctor's degree in department of Radio-TV-Cinema of Istanbul University in 2003 Kalkan, having work as director in Anadolu University Open Education

Faculty Television Production Center since 1992, studies on education television, women's studies, content design in distance learning tools, visual communication, visual learning and perception.

Mail address: Anadolu Üniversitesi Açıköğretim Fakültesi Televizyon Yapım Merkezi, Yunussemre Kampüsü, Eskişehir, Turkey

Tel (Work): +90 222 335 0580 / 2396

GSM: +90 5325676393

Eposta: gulfemg@anadolu.edu.tr

References

- Butler, J. (2005). *Cinsiyet Belası*, Çev. Başak Ertür, İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
- Butler, J. (2009). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet Düzenlemeleri*, Cogito Feminizm, Sayı: 58 Bahar, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Chodorow, N. (2012). *Family Structure and Feminine Personality*, Feminist Theoretical Insights. Erişim
- Cragg, C. & Andrusyszyn, M., & Fraser, J. (2005). *Sources of support for women taking professional programs by distance education*, Journal of Distance Education, 20(1), 21-38.
- Demiray, E. (2013). *Uzaktan Eğitim ve Kadın Eğitiminde Uzaktan Eğitimin Önemi*, Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi Journal of Research in Education and Teaching Mayıs 2013 Cilt:2 Sayı:2 Makale No:18.
- Demiray, E. and Curabay, S. (2000). *Distance Education for Women's Development: A Case Study at Anadolu University, Turkey*. Malaysia, December-2000, Malaysian Journal of Distance Education, 2(2).
- Direk, Z. (2009). *Simon de Beauvoir: Abjeksiyon ve Eros Etiği*, Cogito Feminizm, Sayı: 58/ Bahar, İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Foucault, M. (2010). *Cinselliğin Tarihi*, Çev. Hülya Uğur Tanrıöver, İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.
- Gazioğlu, E. (2014). *Karadeniz Bölgesinin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Rejimi ve Kadınların Toplumsal Konumları*, Karadeniz Araştırmaları Dergisi Sayı 40. ss. 95-108
- Gürses, G. & Adar, B. (2013). *Towards The Field of A Transformative Education: An Evaluation of the Second University Students at Anadolu University in Terms of Gender*, International Women Online Journal of Distance Education April, Volume: 2 Issue: 2 Article: 06.
- Kramarae, Cheri. (2003) *Gender Equity Online: When There Is No Door to Knock On*, içinde Michael Moore & William Anderson, eds. *Handbook of Distance Education*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ökten, Ş. (2009). *Toplumsal Cinsiyet ve İktidar: Güneydoğu Anadolu Bölgesi'nin Toplumsal Cinsiyet Düzeni*, Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, volume 2 / 8 Summer.
- Özbudun, S. &Şafak, B. (2005). *Antropoloji: Kuramlar/ Kuramcılar*, Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.
- Raddon, Arwen. (2007). *Distance Learners Juggling Home, Work, and Study: Is Gender an Issue?*, içinde Pamela Cotterill, Sue Jackson, and Gayle Letherby, eds. Challenges and Negotiations for Women in Higher Education. Lifelong Learning Book Series 9. Netherlands: Springer.
- http://www.google.com.tr/books?hl=tr&lr=&id=RjdsdXRYvOkC&oi=fnd&pg=PA81&dq=chodorow&ots=PKwEWLApjU&sig=sd2x104 - H3hySqC4CdGhEEW99s&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=chodorow&f=false.
- Savran, G. A. (2002). *Özel/Kamusal, Yerel/Evrensel: İkilikleri Aşan Bir Feminizme Doğru*, Praksis 8. Erişim. <http://www.praksis.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/008-09.pdf>.