

ARAŞTIRMA MAKALESİ / RESEARCH ARTICLE

DOI: 10.52122/nisantasisbd.1160432

WHO FEELS MORE DEPRIVED: THE EFFECT OF AGE AND EDUCATION
ON PERCEPTION OF DEPRIVATION

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hasan YENİÇIRAK*

*Kırklareli Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Fakültesi,
Sosyal Hizmet Bölümü

e-posta: hasanyenicirak@klu.edu.tr

ORCID 0000-0001-8769-6669

ABSTRACT

Who feels more deprived in Turkey? What is the role of demographic factors in this perception of deprivation? This study is a search for an answer to these questions. Accordingly, we first examined four models of relative deprivation perception. We considered Davis's, Runciman's, Gurr's, and Crosby's models of explaining relative deprivation. The common point addressed by all four models is that the perception of relative deprivation is based on social comparisons that occur at the individual or group level. Therefore, the perception of deprivation refers to a state of mind and occurs when a person is at a disadvantage when comparing himself/herself to a reference point. In Turkey, one of the most important reference points in social comparisons is the type of political party supported. Secondly, we examined the effect of age and education level on the perception of individual-based relative deprivation, which varies according to the type of political party in Turkey. The results obtained in the present analyses show that the perception of relative deprivation varies according to the age level but does not differ depending on educational level. Participants aged 18-24 who did not experience the 2002 crisis feel more deprived and unhappy. However, older respondents who experienced the 2002 crisis and the preceding 80s and 90s feel less deprivation and discontent than younger people.

Keywords: The Perception of Relative Deprivation, Age, Education, Political Party, Turkey

KİM DAHA YOKSUN HİSSEDİYOR: YAŞ VE EĞİTİMİN YOKSUNLUK ALGISI
ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

ÖZ

Türkiye'de kim kendisini daha yoksun hissediyor? Bu yoksunluk algısının ortaya çıkmasında demografik etkenlerin rolü nedir? Bu çalışma en temelde bu sorulara bir cevap arayışındadır. Bu doğrultuda ilk olarak, görelî yoksunluk algısının dört modelini inceledik. Sırasıyla, Davis'in, Runciman'ın, Gurr'un ve Crosby'nin yoksunluğu açıklama modellerine yer verdik. Dört modelin de değindiği ortak nokta, görelî yoksunluk algısının en temelde bireysel veya grup düzeyinde meydana gelen sosyal karşılaştırmalara dayanması olmuştur. Yoksunluk algısı bir zihin durumunu ifade eder ve kişinin kendisinin ya da ait olduğu bir grubun bir referans noktasıyla karşılaştırıldığında dezavantajlı olduğu durumda ortaya çıkar. Türkiye'de insanlar arasında yapılan karşılaştırmalardaki en önemli referans noktalarından biri ise desteklenen siyasi parti türüdür. İkinci olarak, Türkiye'de siyasi parti türüne göre ortaya çıkan görelî yoksunluk algısının oluşumunda yaş ve eğitimin etkisi inceledik. Elde edilen analiz sonuçlarına göre, siyasi parti türüne göre ortaya çıkan görelî yoksunluk algısı yaş düzeyine bağlı olarak farklılaşmaktayken, eğitim düzeyine bağlı olarak farklılaşmamaktadır. 2002 krizini yaşamamış, 2002-2013 yılları arasındaki ekonomik gelişmeye tanık olmuş 18-24 yaş arası katılımcılar kendilerini daha yoksun ve mutsuz hissediyorlarken, 2002 krizini ve öncesindeki 80'li ve 90'lı yılları yaşamış olan daha yaşlı katılımcılar, gençlere göre daha az yoksunluk ve hoşnutsuzluk hissediyorlar.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Görelî Yoksunluk Algısı, Yaş, Eğitim, Siyasi Parti, Türkiye

Geliş Tarihi/Received: 10.08.2022

Kabul Tarihi/Accepted: 24.12.2022

Yayın Tarihi/Printed Date: 31.12.2022

Kaynak Gösterme: Yeniçirak, H. (2022). "Who Feels More Deprived: The Effect of Age and Education on Perception of Deprivation". *Nişantaşı Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 2(10) 259-271.

INTRODUCTION

Relative deprivation is commonly used concept in the social sciences. It has attracted the attention of political scientists, sociologists, economists, psychologists, and historians. We can point to Gurr (1968a, 1968b) as the most important of the political scientists concerned with relative deprivation. Relative deprivation has also attracted the attention of sociologists such as Davis (1959), Runciman (1966), and Merton and Rossi (1957). While Tilly (1978) is the most important of historians dealing with relative deprivation, Psychologist Crosby (1976) is one of the most important names in relative deprivation.

A central way by which humans obtain information about themselves and their social standing in society is through social comparisons, and relative deprivation describes a negative evaluation resulting from this (Kunst and Obaidi 2020). Therefore, deprivation is relative. Subjective feelings of relative deprivation do not necessarily reflect objective conditions (Chambers et al. 2014). What makes relative deprivation so useful is the recognition that those who should feel deprived by objective standards often do not feel deprived and those who are not objectively deprived often feel that they are (Smith et al. 2012). Because deprivation is relative, it is often true that those who are the most deprived in an objective sense are not the ones most likely to experience deprivation (Crosby, 1976). A person's poverty is measured not by what he has now, but by what he had previously or what others have (Sorokin, 1925).

The original conceptualization of relative deprivation was done by Stouffer and his colleagues. Stouffer and colleagues (1949) observed that "army personnel in rapidly promoted units are less satisfied than personnel in slow moving units". Merton and Rossi (1957) makes a famous critique of the concept, but it was Davis (1959) who tried to put a theoretical system in a relatively formal fashion. There are four standard models of the theory of relative deprivation conceptualized by Stouffer and his colleagues and criticized by Merton and Rossi (Davis, 1959; Runciman, 1966; Gurr, 1970; Crosby, 1976).

1. Four Models of Relative Deprivation

Davis was the first theorist to develop a formal theory of relative deprivation. According to Davies (1969), a person who lacks a desired good or opportunity (X) experiences a sense of injustice whenever he perceives that similar others possess (X). It may be wiser to turn to Crosby to understand Davis' formulation. As Crosby (1966) clearly stated, three determinants are required for the emergence of deprivation in Davis' theory. If one of these is missing, deprivation does not occur. According to Davis, the necessary determinants of deprivation are that the individuals who lack X,

- (a) must perceive that a similar other has X
- (b) want X
- (c) feel entitled to X. (Crosby, 1976)

The second model of the theory of relative deprivation belongs to Runciman (1966). According to Runciman, "the magnitude of a relative deprivation is the extent of the difference between the desired situation and that of the person desiring it... The degree of a relative deprivation is the intensity with which it is felt" (Runciman, 1966, 10). According to Runciman, the necessary determinants of deprivation are that the individuals who lack some desired good or opportunity (X),

- (a) want X
- (b) compare themselves with better-off others
- (c) feel they deserve X
- (d) think it feasible to attain (Runciman, 1966, 11).

After Runciman (1966) determines what are the conditions necessary for deprivation to occur, he divides relative deprivation into its types: egoistical and fraternal deprivation. Egoistical relative deprivation is a type of personal discontent that occurs when an individual compares his or her own situation to that of others (in-group or out-group members, whereas fraternal relative deprivation is a more social discontent that occurs when and individual compares the situation of his or her group as a whole to that of an out-group (Runciman, 1966).

In contrast to Davis and Runciman, Gurr claimed that an individual experiences deprivation only when he thinks that it is not feasible to obtain X. Gurr defined relative deprivation as actors' perceptions of the discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities (Gurr, 1968a). "Value expectations are the goods and conditions of life to which people believe they are justifiably entitled. The referents of value capabilities are to be found largely in the social and physical environment: They are conditions that determine people's perceived chances of getting or keeping the values they legitimately expect to attain" (Gurr, 1968b).

These three models we mainly mentioned overlap, but there are some differences among them. This difference arises according to the feasibility factors. Crosby (1976) reveals the difference among these three models as follows: For Runciman, deprivation exists when the perceived feasibility of obtaining X is high; for Gurr, deprivation exists when the perceived feasibility is low; while for Davis, feasibility is irrelevant.

After Crosby (1976) noted the differences among three models of the theory of relative deprivation, he built his own standard model of the theory of relative deprivation. According to Crosby (1976), five preconditions are required for relative deprivation to occur. If one or more of the elements is lacking, relative deprivation does not occur. The person who lacks X must

- (a) see that someone else (other) possess X,
- (b) want X,
- (c) feel entitled to X,
- (d) think it feasible to obtain X, and
- (e) lack a sense of personal responsibility for not having X (Crosby, 1976)

1.1 Aims of the Study

From the mid 20th century, in Europe, the relative deprivation theory has been very commonly used in many areas. Relative deprivation theory was applied to social injustice (Xu et al. 2017), social inequality (Kim et al. 2018; Sagioglu et al. 2018), economic disparity (Nieuwenhuis et al. 2017), income and wealth (Rauscher et al. 2017), violent extremism (Kunst and Obaidi 2020; Chen et al. 2018), civic and political protest (Ostby et al. 2009; Walker and Mann 1987), and economic voting (Lewis-Beck and Nadeau 2011; Ohmura 2018). However, studies examining the relationship between relative deprivation perception and age and education are limited. Callan et al. (2015) examined age-related differences in social comparison orientation and personal relative deprivation. Callan, Kim, and Matthews's (2015) findings provide evidence that older adults report lower levels of social comparison tendency that, in turn, relate to lower levels of personal relative deprivation. Mishra and Carleton (2015) also measured potential objective source of relative deprivation. Mishra and Carleton (2015) reached that subjective feelings of personal relative deprivation were significantly and positively associated with age while relative deprivation was significantly and negatively associated with education level.

In Turkey, relative deprivation theory has been rarely used in some areas (Özdemir 2018; Özdemir et al. 2019; Özdemir and Özkan 2020). Özdemir's (2018) study examined perceptions of individual based-relative deprivation according to the type of political party supported. In the current study, we examined the effect of age and education level on the perception of individual-based relative deprivation, which varies according to the type of political party. Accordingly, the research hypotheses are as follows:

H1- The perception of relative deprivation will differ according to the age level.

H2- The perception of relative deprivation will differ according to education level.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

The data were collected from 127 participants (65 men and 62 women; age range: 18-54 years). The snowball sampling method was used. Participants were informed about the research to be conducted in advance and consent to voluntarily participate in the study was obtained from each

participant. The distribution of the participants according to demographic variables is given in Table 1.

Table 1: The distribution of participants by demographic variables

Variable	Group	N	N%
Gender	Female	62	48.8
	Male	65	51.2
Age	18-24	29	22.8
	25-34	64	50.4
	35-54	34	26.8
Education Level	Primary and Secondary education	32	25.2
	Undergraduate	62	48.8
	Graduate	33	26
Absolute Income	4.000 TL and less (low level)	52	40.9
	4.001 – 8.000 TL (medium level)	40	31.5
	8.001 TL and above (high level)	35	27.6
Perceived Income	Low	40	31.5
	Medium	67	52.8
	High	20	15.7
Supported Political Party	AKP	33	26
	CHP	39	30.7
	MHP	12	9.4
	İYİ Party	14	11
	HDP	12	9.4
	Other	17	13.4

2.2 Instruments

2.2.1 Demographic Information Form

The demographic information form includes information about gender, age, education level, housing, perceived and absolute income level, type of supported political party.

2.2.2 Individual-based Relative Deprivation Scale

In the current study, the individual-based relative deprivation scale developed by Runciman (1966) and adapted by Özdemir et al. (2019) was used. The relative deprivation scale aims to make a judgment about the situation that the person is in by asking them to compare themselves with other people. These comparisons were made at the party level they supported. The participants were asked to compare themselves with other party supporters based on their economic, social, and political opportunities and indicate how much individual-based relative deprivation they felt. Some items of the scale used in the study are as follows: “When I compare myself with X party supporters, I am aware that X party supporters have better economic, social, and political opportunities than me”; “When I compare myself to the X party supporters, the economic, social, and political opportunities I have are not satisfied me”; “I think that I deserve the economic, social, and political opportunities that X party supporters have”.

2.2.3 Procedure. The data were collected online via Google Forms from participants who volunteered to participate after reading the informed consent form. The participants were informed about the research, and the research link was sent to those who agreed to participate.

3. Results

All analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 20 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). To evaluate the differences in perception of individual-based relative deprivation, a series of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted, followed by separate post hoc comparisons for the AKP, CHP, MHP, and İYİ Party individual-based relative deprivation subscales. In post hoc comparisons Tukey’s HSD test was used for equal variances and the Games-Howell test was used for non-equal variances. Since the HDP subscale violated the assumption of normality, the Kruskal-Wallis test, which is the non-parametric version of one-way ANOVA, was applied.

3.1 Descriptive Statistics on Individual-Based Relative Deprivation According to Type of Political Party Being Compared

Before examining how perceptions of individual-based relative deprivation differ in each subscale according to the type of political party supported and perceived and/or absolute income level, we begin by looking at the descriptive statistical data to see how the perception of individual-based relative deprivation differs according to the type of political party being compared. The perception of individual-based relative deprivation is highest when participants compare themselves with AKP supporters (MAKP=24.68). This is followed by comparisons with MHP supporters, CHP supporters, and İYİ Party supporters, respectively (MMHP=20.41; MCHP=18.07; MİYİ Party=16.84). The perception of individual-based relative deprivation is lowest when participants compare themselves with HDP supporters (MHDP=12.31) (see Table 2).

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of individual-based relative deprivation according to type of political party being compared

Type of Political Party Being Compared	N	Min.	Max.	M	SD
AKP	127	5	35	24.68	7.33
CHP	127	5	35	18.07	7.37
MHP	127	5	35	20.41	7.82
İYİ Party	127	5	35	16.84	8.02
HDP	127	5	35	12.31	7.92

3.2 Perception of Individual-based Relative Deprivation According to Age Level

A series of one-way between-groups ANOVAs for AKP, CHP, MHP, İYİ Party individual-based relative deprivation subscales, and the Kruskal-Wallis test for HDP subscale was conducted to explore the impact of the age level on the perception of individual-based relative deprivation. Participants were divided into three groups according to their age level (Group 1: 18-24, Group 2: 25-34, Group 3: 35-54).

For AKP subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was not a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three age level groups: $F(2, 124) = 1.21, p = .300$. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at table 6. Perceived individual-based relative deprivation means according to age level are shown at Table 3.

For CHP subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was a statistically significant differences at the $p < .001$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three age level groups: $F(2, 124) = 8.95, p = .000$ The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was $.13 (\eta_p^2 = .13)$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Games-Howell test indicated that participants ages between 18-24 ($M = 22.86, SD = 7.99$) indicated greater individual-based deprivation than participants ages between 25-34 ($M = 16.61, SD = 5.73$) and participants ages between 35-54 ($M = 16.73, SD = 8.02$) when they compared themselves with CHP supporters. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at table 6. Perceived individual-based relative deprivation means according to age level are shown at Table 3.

For MHP subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three age level groups: $F(2, 124) = 3.51, p = .033$ The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was $.05 (\eta_p^2 = .05)$. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that

participants ages between 18-24 ($M= 23.45$, $SD= 8.04$) indicated greater individual-based deprivation than participants ages between 35-54 ($M= 18.38$, $SD= 7.52$) when they compared themselves with MHP supporters. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at table 6. Perceived individual-based relative deprivation means according to age level are shown at Table 3.

For İYİ Party subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was a statistically significant differences at the $p < .001$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three age level groups: $F(2, 124) = 8.49$, $p= .000$) The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .12 ($\eta_p^2= .12$). Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that participants ages between 18-24 ($M= 21.93$, $SD= 8.14$) indicated greater individual-based deprivation than participants ages between 25-34 ($M= 15.22$, $SD= 6.50$) and participants ages between 35-54 ($M= 15.56$, $SD= 8.90$) when they compared themselves with İYİ Party supporters. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at table 6. Perceived individual-based relative deprivation means according to age level are shown at Table 3.

For HDP subscale, according to Kruskal-Wallis results there was not a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three age levels: $H(2) = 2.53$, $p= .283$) Medians and post-hoc comparisons are shown at Table 3.

3.3 Perception of Individual-based Relative Deprivation According to Education Level

A series of one-way between-groups ANOVAs for AKP, CHP, MHP, İYİ Party individual-based relative deprivation subscales, and the Kruskal-Wallis test for HDP subscale was conducted to explore the impact of the education level on the perception of individual-based relative deprivation. Participants were divided into three groups according to their education level (Group 1: Primary and Secondary Education, Group 2: Undergraduate, Group 3: Graduate).

For AKP subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was not a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three education level groups: $F(2, 124) = 0.67$, $p= .512$. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at Table 4.

For CHP subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was not a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three education level groups: $F(2, 124) = 1.78$, $p= .174$. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at Table 4.

For MHP subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was not a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three education level groups: $F(2, 124) = 0.12$, $p= .889$. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at Table 4.

For İYİ Party subscale, according to one-way between-groups ANOVA results there was not a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three education level groups: $F(2, 124) = 2.04$, $p= .134$. Means, standard deviation and post-hoc comparisons are shown at Table 4.

For HDP subscale, according to Kruskal-Wallis results there was not a statistically significant differences at the $p < .05$ level in individual-based relative deprivation scores for the three education levels: $H(2) = 3.11$, $p= .211$) Medians and post-hoc comparisons are shown at Table 4.

Table 3: Summary of individual-based relative deprivation results for age level

Age Level	Individual-based Relative Deprivation										
	AKP Subscale		CHP Subscale		MHP Subscale		İYİ Party Subscale		HDP Subscale		
	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Md	Comparisons
18-24	26.41 (6.96)		22.86 (7.99)	18-24 > 25-34*** 18-24 > 35-54**	23.45 (8.04)	18-24 > 35-54*	21.93 (8.14)	18-24 > 25-34*** 18-24 > 35-54**	14.79 (9.60)	12.0	
25-34	24.48 (7.55)		16.61 (5.73)		20.11 (7.58)		15.22 (6.50)		10.97 (6.57)	8.0	
35-54	23.59 (7.17)		16.73 (8.02)		18.38 (7.52)		15.56 (8.90)		12.71 (8.38)	11.50	

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

Table 4: Summary of individual-based relative deprivation results for education level

Education Level	Individual-based Relative Deprivation										
	AKP Subscale		CHP Subscale		MHP Subscale		İYİ Party Subscale		HDP Subscale		
	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Comparisons	M (SD)	Md	Comparisons
Primary and Secondary Education	24.47 (6.84)		17.19 (8.09)		20.50 (8.30)		17.97 (8.70)		13.66 (9.36)	11.0	
Undergraduate	25.39 (7.29)		19.31 (7.25)		20.66 (7.58)		17.53 (8.23)		12.98 (8.0)	11.0	
Graduate	23.58 (7.92)		16.61 (6.65)		19.85 (8.01)		14.45 (6.54)		9.73 (5.56)	8.0	

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, we examined the effect of age and education level on the perception of individual-based relative deprivation, which varies according to the type of political party in Turkey. First, we looked at how the perception of individual-based relative deprivation differed according to the type of political party being compared. We found that the perception of individual-based relative deprivation was highest when participants compared themselves with AKP supporters. This was followed by comparisons with MHP supporters, CHP supporters, and İYİ Party supporters, respectively. The perception of individual-based relative deprivation was lowest when participants compared themselves with HDP supporters.

We then separately examined the effect of age and education level on the perception of individual-based relative deprivation. The results obtained in the present analyses show that the perception of individual-based relative deprivation varies according to the age level (hypothesis 1). When participants in the 18-24 age range compared themselves with CHP and İYİ Party supporters, they felt more relative deprivation than participants in both the 25-34 and 35-54 age ranges. In addition to that, when participants in the 18-24 age range compared themselves with MHP supporters, they only felt more relative deprivation than participants in the 35-54 age range. In other words, the results obtained in the study show that young people feel more deprived compared to the middle and older age groups. This result is also consistent with Callan, Kim, and Matthews's (2015) findings.

This result obtained in the study become more understandable when evaluated together with the economic data of the last 20 years in Turkey (Yeniçirak, 2022). Before 2002, there was deep unrest in society. GNI per capita was very low. With the AKP coming to power in 2002, significant progress had been made in the economic sphere. This progress in the economic sphere had also been related to the political and cultural spheres (Tuğal 2009; Turam 2007). This progress had continued until 2013 and had reached its peak in 2013. GNI per capita, which was \$3,660 in 2002, had risen to \$10,931 in 2008 and had reached its peak at \$12,519 in 2013. This economic progress, which had reached its peak in 2013, has been replaced by a recession since 2014. This recession in the economic sphere has also been related to the political and cultural spheres (Öniş 2015; Özsoy Boyunsuz 2016). GNI per capita, which saw its peak in 2013 at \$12,519, dropped to \$8,599 in 2020.

Economic progress between 2002 and 2013 gave way to the economic recession since 2014. This situation explains why the perception of relative deprivation occurs more in young people than in the elderly. Participants between the ages of 18-24 who did not experience the 2002 crisis but had witnessed the economic progress between 2002 and 2013. They then experienced the post-2014 decline. Therefore, when assessing today's data, those aged 18-24 always have the period of economic progress in mind, so they feel more deprived and dissatisfied. However, older participants who have experienced the 2002 crisis and before, consider the 80s and 90s when evaluating today's data. Therefore, they feel less deprivation and discontent than young people, although they are unsatisfied with today's conditions.

In comparisons made with AKP supporters and HDP supporters, there was no statistical difference depending on age level. When compared with AKP supporters, the relative deprivation scores of participants in all age groups are high. When compared with HDP supporters, the relative deprivation scores of participants in all age groups are low. In other words, while all age groups felt deprivation against AKP supporters, no age group felt deprivation against HDP supporters. The results obtained in the present analyses show that the perception of individual-based relative deprivation does not vary according to the education level.

To sum up, in the present study, we examined the effect of age and education level on the perception of individual-based relative deprivation, which varies according to the type of political party in Turkey. The results showed that the perception of relative deprivation varied according to the age level. However, the perception of relative deprivation did not differ

depending on educational level. The most important contribution of this study is to examine the relationship between the theory of relative deprivation and demographic variables related to the individual characteristics of the participants (age and education).

KAYNAKÇA

- Callan, M. J., Kim, H., and Matthews, W. J., (2015). "Age Differences in Social Comparison Tendency and Personal Relative Deprivations", *Personality and Individual Differences* 87: 196-199
- Chambers, J. R., Swan, L. K., and Heesacker, M., (2014). "Better of than we know: Distorted perceptions of incomes and income inequality in America", *Psychological Science*. 25(2): 613-618
- Chen, X-Y., Wang X-Q., Liu, J-P., Dong, S-H., Zhu, J-C., and Huo, J-C., (2018). "Effects of Relative Deprivation on Intention to Rebel: A Multiple Mediation Model", *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology* 12. doi: 10.1017/prp.2017.25.
- Crosby, F., (1976). "A Model of Egoistical Relative Deprivation", *Psychological Review* (83):85-113.
- Davis, J. A., (1959). "A Formal Interpretation of the Theory of Relative Deprivation", *Sociometry* 22(4):280-96. doi: 10.2307/2786046.
- Gurr, T. R., (1968a). "A Causal Model of Civil Strife: A Comparative Analysis Using New Indices", *The American Political Science Review* 62(4):1104-24. doi: 10.2307/1953907.
- Gurr, T. R., (1968b). "Psychological Factors in Civil Violence", *World Politics* 20(2):245-78. doi: 10.2307/2009798.
- Kim, H., Callan, M. J., Ana I. G., and William J. S., (2018). "Social Comparison Processes in the Experience of Personal Relative Deprivation", *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 48(9):519-32. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12531.
- Kunst, J. R., and Obaidi, M., (2020). "Understanding Violent Extremism in the 21st Century: the (Re)emerging Role of Relative Deprivation", *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 35: 55-59.
- Lewis-Beck, M. S., and Nadeau, R., (2011). "Economic Voting Theory: Testing New Dimensions", *Electoral Studies* 30(2):288-294. doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2010.09.001.
- Merton, R., and Alice, R., (1957). "Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior", in *Social Theory and Social Structure*, edited by R. Merton. New York: Free Press.
- Mishra, S., and Carleton R. N., (2015), "Subjective Relative Deprivation is Associated with Poorer Physical and Mental Health", *Social Science & Medicine* 147: 144-149
- Nieuwenhuis, J., van Ham, M., Yu, R., Branje, S., Meeus, W., and Hooimeijer, P., (2017). "Being Poorer than the Rest of the Neighborhood: Relative Deprivation and Problem Behavior of Youth", *J Youth Adolescence*. 46: 1891-1904. doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0668-6
- Ohmura, H., (2018). "Economic Voting Using Egotropic Evaluation as an Information Cue: How Absolute and Relative Income Affects Socio-Economic Evaluations and Retrospection", *Behaviormetrika* 45(1): 57-89. doi: 10.1007/s41237-017-0040-x.
- Öniş, Z., (2015). "Monopolising the Centre: The AKP and the Uncertain Path of Turkish Democracy", *The International Spectator*, 50(2), 22-41. doi:10.1080/03932729.2015.1015335
- Østby, G., Nordås, R., and Rød, J. K., (2009). "Regional Inequalities and Civil Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa" *International Studies Quarterly* 53(2): 301-24

- Özdemir, F., (2018). "The Fusion of Individual and Group Levels: The Case of Political Party Supporters within Extreme Pro-Group Action Process". Middle East Technical University, unpublished doctoral thesis.
- Özdemir, F., and Özkan, T. (2020). "Birey-Temelli ve Grup-Temelli Süreçlerin Kaynaşımı: Aşırı Fedakâr Grup-Yanlı Davranış Sergileme Eğilimini Yordama", *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları* 23(45): 78-93. doi: 10.31828/tpy1301996120200413m000019.
- Özdemir, F., Tekeş, B., and Öner-Özkan, B. (2019). "Birey Düzeyinde Göreli Yoksunluk ve Öznel Esenlik Arasındaki Dolaylı İlişki", *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi* 34(84): 37-49. doi: 10.31828/tpd1300443320180811m000009.
- Özsoy Boyunsuz, Ş. (2016). "The AKP'S proposal for a "Turkish type of presidentialism" in comparative context", *Turkish Studies*, 17(1), 68–90. doi:10.1080/14683849.2015.1135064
- Rauscher, E., Friedline, T., and Banerjee, M. (2017). "We're not rich, but we're definitely not poor: Ypung children's conceptions of social class", *Children and Youth Services Review* 83: 101-111
- Runciman, W. G. (1966). *Relative Deprivation and Social Justice: A Study of Attitudes to Social Inequality in Twentieth-Century England*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sagioglu, C., Forstmann, M., and Greitemeyer, T. (2019). "Belief in Social Mobility Mitigates Hostility Resulting from Disadvantaged Social Standing", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45(4):541-556, doi:10.1177/0146167218789073
- Smith, H. J., Pettigrew, T. F., Pippin, G. M., and Bialosiewicz, S. (2012). "Relative Deprivation: A Theoretical and Meta-Analytic Review", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, XX(X): 1-30, doi: 10.1177/1088868311430825
- Sorokin, P. A. (1925). *The Sociology of Revolution*. J.B. Lippincott
- Stouffer, S. A., Edward A. S., Leland C. D., Shirley A. S., and Robin M. W. (1949). *The American Soldier: Adjustment during Army Life. (Studies in Social Psychology in World War II), Vol. 1*. Oxford, England: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Tilly, C. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. New York: Random House
- Tuğal, C. (2009). *Passive Revolution: Absorbing the Islamic Challenge to Capitalism*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Turam, B. (2007). *Between Islam and the State*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Walker, I., and Mann, L. (1987). "Unemployment, Relative Deprivation, and Social Protest", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 13(2): 275-283
- Xu, G., Shen, H., and Bock, C. (2017). "Perceived Violation of Rights and Interests and Collective Action Participation in China", *Social Behavior and Personality*. 45(5): 719-732. doi:10.2224/sbp.5872
- Yeniçirak, H. (2022). "The J-Curve Model: An Alternative Way of Understanding Collective Discontent in Turkey", *İmgelem*, 6 (10): 205-220.

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

**KİM DAHA YOKSUN HİSSEDİYOR:
YAŞ VE EĞİTİMİN YOKSUNLUK ALGISI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ**

Giriş ve Çalışmanın Amacı: Birey-temelli görelî yoksunluk kuramına göre yoksunluğun asıl kaynağı kişilerin yaptıkları karşılaştırmalardır. Görelî yoksunluk algısı karşılaştırmalarla başlar. Bu yüzden yoksunluk mutlak değildir, aslında bir zihin durumunu yansıtır. Stouffer ve arkadaşları tarafından kavramsallaştırılan görelî yoksunluğun dört modeli vardır. Sırasıyla, Davis, Runciman, Crosby ve Gurr tarafından ileri sürülen dört modelin de bize sunduğu şey görelî yoksunluk algısını ortaya çıkaran temel noktanın karşılaştırmalar olduğu gerçeğidir. Karşılaştırmalarda pek çok referans noktaları olabilir. Etnik köken, yerleşim yeri, meslek vs. Bunlardan biri de, özellikle ülkemiz açısından düşündüğümüzde, desteklenen siyasi parti türüdür. Kişiler bağlı oldukları siyasi parti türüne göre kendilerini diğer parti destekçileriyle karşılaştırmaktadırlar. Çalışmanın amacı da desteklenen siyasi parti türüne göre ortaya çıkan birey-temelli görelî yoksunluk algısında yaşın ve eğitimin etkisini incelemektir. Hipotezlerimiz şunlardır:

- 1- Birey temelli görelî yoksunluk algısı yaşa göre değişmektedir.
- 2- Birey-temelli görelî yoksunluk algısı eğitim seviyesine göre değişmektedir.

Kavramsal/kuramsal çerçeve: Avrupa'da 20.yy'ın ortalarından itibaren görelî yoksunluk teorisi üzerine pek çok alanda çalışıldı. Görelî yoksunluk teorisi toplumsal eşitsizlik, gelir düzeyi, şiddet olayları, politik protesto, ekonomik oylama gibi pek çok bağlamda incelendi. Buna karşın görelî yoksunluk algısı ile yaş ve eğitim arasındaki ilişkiyi inceleyen çalışmalar sınırlıdır. Callan ve ark (2015) ve Mishra ve Carleton (2015) görelî yoksunluk algısının ortaya çıkmasında yaşın etkili olduğunu göstermiştir. Türkiye'de ise bu alandaki çalışmalar çok sınırlı kalmıştır. Bu çalışmanın en önemli katkısı, görelî yoksunluk teorisi ile katılımcıların bireysel özelliklerine (yaş ve eğitim) ilişkin demografik değişkenler arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesidir.

Yöntem ve Bulgular: Çalışmadaki veriler 65'i erkek 62'si kadın olmak üzere toplamda 127 kişiden toplanmıştır. 29 kişi 18-24 yaş aralığında; 64 kişi 25-34 yaş aralığında; 34 kişi de 35-54 yaş aralığındadır. Katılımcıların eğitim seviyesine baktığımızda; 32'si ilk ve orta öğretim, 62'si lisan, 33'ü lisansüstü. Runciman tarafından geliştirilen, Özdemir ve ark. tarafından uyarlanan birey-temelli görelî yoksunluk ölçeği kullanıldı. Birey-temelli görelî yoksunluk ölçeği, kişinin kendilerini ekonomik, sosyal ve politik imkanlar açısından diğer siyasi parti destekçileriyle karşılaştırmalarına dayanmaktadır.

Birey-temelli görelî yoksunluk algısının ortaya çıkmasında yaşın etkili olduğu görülmüştür. CHP alt ölçeğinde üç yaş grubu arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık ortaya çıkmıştır. Katılımcılar kendilerini CHP destekçileriyle karşılaştırdıklarında, 18-24 yaş arasındaki katılımcılar, 25-34 ile 35-54 yaş arasındaki katılımcılara göre daha fazla yoksunluk hissetmişlerdir.

İYİ Parti alt ölçeğinde de benzer şekilde üç yaş grubu arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık ortaya çıkmıştır. Katılımcılar kendilerini İYİ Parti destekçileriyle karşılaştırdıklarında, 18-24 yaş arasındaki katılımcılar, 25-34 ile 35-54 yaş arasındaki katılımcılara göre daha fazla yoksunluk hissetmişlerdir.

MHP alt ölçeğinde de yaş grupları arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık ortaya çıkmıştır. Katılımcılar kendilerini MHP destekçileriyle karşılaştırdıklarında, 18-24 yaş arasındaki katılımcılar, 35-54 yaş arasındaki katılımcılardan daha fazla yoksunluk hissetmişlerdir.

AKP alt ölçeğinde ve HDP alt ölçeğinde ise üç yaş grubu arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık ortaya çıkmamıştır.

Görelî yoksunluk algısının oluşumunda eğitimin etkisi incelendiğinde, hiçbir parti alt ölçeğinde eğitim seviyeleri arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık ortaya çıkmamıştır.

Sonuç ve Öneriler: Yaşın etkisini incelerken; Katılımcılar kendilerini AKP destekçileriyle karşılaştırdıklarında anlamlı bir farklılık ortaya çıkmadı çünkü bütün yaş gruplarındaki katılımcılar kendilerini AKP destekçileriyle karşılaştırdıklarında çok yüksek düzeyde yoksunluk hissetmektedir. HDP destekçileriyle yapılan karşılaştırmalarda da farklılık ortaya çıkmadı çünkü bütün yaş gruplarındaki katılımcılar kendilerini HDP destekçileriyle karşılaştırdıklarında çok düşük düzeyde yoksunluk hissetmektedir. CHP, İYİ Parti ve MHP destekçileriyle yapılan karşılaştırmalara baktığımızda, 18-24 yaş arasındaki katılımcıların diğer yaş gruplarına göre daha fazla yoksunluk hissetmektedirler. Bu sonuçlar Türkiye'nin son 20 yılındaki ekonomik koşullarla birlikte değerlendirildiğinde çok daha kolay anlaşılabilir. 2002 ve öncesinde Türkiye'de derin bir toplumsal hoşnutsuzluk vardı. 2002 ile birlikte ekonomik alanda ilerlemeler kaydedilmiştir. 2013'de zirve noktasına ulaşan bu ekonomik ilerleme, 2014'den itibaren yerini gerilemeye bırakmıştır. Bu durum görelî yoksunluk algısının niçin yaşlılardan çok gençlerde daha fazla ortaya çıktığını açıklamaktadır. 2002 krizini yaşamamış, 2002-2013 yılları arasındaki ekonomik gelişmeye tanık olmuş 18-24 yaş arası katılımcılar kendilerini daha yoksun ve mutsuz hissediyorlarken, 2002 krizini ve öncesindeki 80'li ve 90'lı yılları yaşamış olan daha yaşlı katılımcılar, gençlere göre daha az yoksunluk ve hoşnutsuzluk hissediyorlar.

KATKI ORANI BEYANI VE ÇIKAR ÇATIŞMASI BİLDİRİMİ

Sorumlu Yazar <i>Responsible/Corresponding Author</i>	Hasan Yeniçırak			
Makalenin Başlığı <i>Title of Manuscript</i>	Who Feels More Deprived: The Effect of Age And Education on Perception of Deprivation			
Tarih <i>Date</i>	10/08/2022			
Makalenin türü (Araştırma makalesi, Derleme vb.) <i>Manuscript Type (Research Article, Review etc.)</i>	Research Article			
Yazarların Listesi / List of Authors				
<i>Sıra No</i>	Adı-Soyadı <i>Name - Surname</i>	Katkı Oranı <i>Author Contributions</i>	Çıkar Çatışması <i>Conflicts of Interest</i>	Destek ve Teşekkür (Varsa) <i>Support and Acknowledgment</i>
1	Hasan Yeniçırak	%100	Çıkar Çatışması Bulunmamaktadır.	