

AN EXAMINATION OF DEMOCRATIC ATTITUDES OF PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS

Selma GÜLEÇ, Ezgi Gizem BALÇIK

Uludağ University, TURKEY

Abstract. As democracy can develop better in a society of democratic people, democracy education can also get its intended goals better in a democratic school environment. As the most influential people in a school environment were teachers, this study, too, aimed to determine their levels of democratic attitudes. In the present study, 60 primary school teachers working in the schools attached to the Bursa Metropolitan Municipality were surveyed. The relationships between their attitudes and some variables were studied. These variables included school they work, age, gender, marital status, number of children they have, education level, teaching experience and number of brothers or sisters. The questionnaire used for this study was validated by Aydoğan & Kukul (2003) based on previous studies made by Gomleksiz (1988), Yildirim (1994) and Atasoy (1997). For the validity of the questionnaire, Cronbach Alpha coefficient (0.829) was calculated. The results suggest that teachers show very positive attitude with a score of 103. When the items were examined individually, some significant relationships were found with the variables. Teachers should have positive democratic attitudes in order to give lessons of democracy to their students. An appropriate and encouraging envi-

ronment should be prepared in order for students to gain desired democratic outcomes. In a democratic environment, teachers' positive attitudes will help their students to gain critical thinking skills, effective discussion skills, capability for fighting against inequity, cooperation and collaboration skills, and showing empathy and respect for diversity.

Keywords: democratic attitudes, primary school teacher, democracy education

Introduction

The most important resource for a country to achieve modern social, economic and technological levels that it aims to reach is the human quality. For this reason, human resources must be well-trained. The educational system is the main factor to train the human quality (Aycan, 1997). The first of the most important institutions affecting the development and socialization of an individual is the family and the second is the school. Learning experiences at school will help the child or the adolescent acquire academic information and skills and develop an active, emotionally and socially stable personality capable of adapting to society (Gözütok, 1995).

Democracy can survive and develop only in the societies composed of individuals having internalized democracy as a course of conduct and implementing democratic principles in their lives. In this sense, maintaining democracy can be achieved through training individuals to adopt democratic values, in other words, through democracy education (Gömleksiz, 1988). Gözütok (1995) points out that democracy education aims to help individuals become active citizens knowing, adopting, respecting and advocating human rights and freedoms.

In a modern society, school does not aim to train individuals just to consume the available information, but to produce new information, using it to

solve problems and make independent decisions based on information, learning continuously and open to development (Doğanay, 2000). Democracy education, too, aims at training individuals to possess these characteristics. Accordingly, to create a modern society, understanding of democracy and democracy education must be closely related.

For democracy education to be able to reach its aim there must be a democratic environment. The benefits of democracy education, according to Magendzo, can be mentioned as follows (Cited by Yeşil, 2002): (1) It helps individuals develop their abilities of criticizing and inquiring; (2) Schools are compelled to follow the developments in both overt and covert programs and do what is required. Thus, they become institutions which are open to changes and follow developments. These changes and developments are not only associated with contents but also with methodology and evaluation; (3) Democracy affects school culture and becomes a way of life first at schools then in the whole society; (4) The introduction of democracy to schools pioneers a deep and real educational reform.

According to Kepenekçi (2006), the followings are the factors making a school democratic: i) achieving a reciprocal communication away from violence but based on love, respect, understanding and tolerance aimed by all people in a school and classroom environment; ii) achieving participation by all the members of a school (teacher, student and parent) to decisions that are of interest to themselves in both school and classroom managements.

This matter lies within the responsibility of teachers who are the most important and effective element of the educational process. The most important element developing the democratic values that young people acquire in family is the teacher. The success of an educational system depends mainly on the types of qualities its teachers and other staff is supposed to process in order to implement that very system. For this reason, it can be stated that a school is good to the extent to which the teachers working there are good (Büyük-

karagöz & Üre, 1994). Küçükahmet (1989) denotes that democratic individuals can be trained at schools only by teachers having internalized democracy and teachers' behaviors have effects on students; and there are more than 2000 studies indicating the fact that if these behaviors are repeated they are likely to be observed in students. In a study of hers, she emphasizes the importance of the fact that teachers should exhibit democratic behaviors while giving their students democracy education. Thus, she indicates that there is a positive relationship between a teacher's being democratic and students' behaving in a democratic way.

A teacher should be conscious of what must be done to develop a democratic life culture and entrenching ethical and moral behaviors. Teachers should be the most fundamental supporters of democratic life by showing their attaching importance to democratic principles not only with their words but also with their behaviors. Furthermore, a good teacher should prepare an incentive environment and provide students with appropriate opportunities so that they can realize their democratic acquisitions. In a formal educational institution accepted as the most fundamental element in having individuals acquire democratic attitudes and behaviors, these attitudes and behaviors are achieved, with no doubt, through the model attitudes and behaviors exhibited by teachers (Genç, 2006).

In the democratic education, education has the individual, in other words, the student at its center. Each individual is accepted as a unique personality and shown respect. Since it is the members of a society who make decisions in democracies, the actual element is the student in the democratic education. The teacher is no longer a person giving a lesson in a classical meaning and teaching students something, but has turned out to become a person helping students to access information and learn it, guiding them, planning activities and having them participate to planned activities actively, and in summary, teaching them how to learn (Çağlar, 1997). In a democratic educational institu-

tion, the teacher is expected to help students to develop personalities appropriate for their abilities and dispositions by perceiving them as values different from one another and to mature with the feelings of self-confidence and self-respect. In the democratic educational process, students, on the one hand, are taught by having them to comprehend precise information included in various branches of science, and on the other hand, they are helped to acquire a habit of accessing information by themselves and a capability of making healthy evaluations. During this educational process, every thought is made open to criticism, examination and discussion by the teacher and the students (Maboçoğlu, 1998). As Başar (2004) states, another characteristic of the democratic educational environment is the respect shown to thinking and freedom of expressing thoughts. Students should be given the opportunity to express what they feel and think about any matter with no hesitation, make criticisms and exhibit an attitude which is open to criticism and discussion. Raising individuals possessing these characteristics depends on the suitability of the educational environment. The teacher as the most effective and important element of the educational process should provide a democratic environment. The attitude exhibited by the teacher toward the student desiring to express his or her thoughts, making criticisms, claiming his or her rights, inquiring and searching will, of course, has influence on the whole class, and either help them take a step in the way toward becoming democratic individuals or hinder them. According to Ulusavaş, in the democratic education, the teacher will help students to acquire the skills of thinking critically, discussing effectively, struggling against inequity, working cooperatively and with solidarity, and will provide them with acquisitions on the matters such as feeling empathy, identity achievement and self-actualization, action-taking, participation, respecting to differences, being prepared to work for a better world, developing responsibility by thinking of both today's and future generations, etc. (Ulusavaş, 1998). According to Cangelosi (Cited by Başar, 2004), in a democratic classroom environment, the teacher should be neither authoritative nor permissive. The

student should have the right to speak while determining classroom rules, and be motivated to his or her work in order not to get a reward or punishment but with the awareness of the real benefits of his or her work and through participating to its processes. The teacher as a democratic leader asks students for their opinions, comes to terms with them about what to be done and gives them the right to choose their own studying arrangements.

As San (1985) specifies, “democratic attitudes and behaviors” is a system that can be learned and adopted through practicing in daily life. Consequently, first of all, teachers should exhibit democratic attitudes and behaviors. The present study aims to investigate into the extent to which the classroom teachers working in elementary schools exhibit democratic behaviors and if these behaviors vary depending on the factors such as the length of service, gender and age.

For this purpose, answers for the following questions were sought: i) do teachers’ democratic attitudes vary according to the levels of schools from which they graduate? ii) do teachers’ democratic attitudes vary according to the length of their service? iii) do teachers’ democratic attitudes vary according to their age and gender? iv) do teachers’ democratic attitudes vary according to their marital statuses or having children statuses? v) Do teachers’ democratic attitudes vary according to the SES levels of the school in which they work?

Method

In the present study the democratic attitudes of the participant teachers were determined through using questionnaire and evaluated according to proper variables.

Sample

The population of the present study is limited to the total of 60 teachers working in the primary schools attached to the Bursa Metropolitan Municipality. The schools were separated into three groups according to their socioeconomic levels as low, mid and high and 20 teachers from each group were selected for the purpose of the study.

Data collection tool

To collect data for the study, the questionnaire technique was used, and to obtain personal information about the teachers, the personal information form developed by Gözütok (1995) was used by adding the item “more than 21-25 years” to the item of the questionnaire inquiring the length of service. No new questionnaire was formed for the study. The questionnaire was validated by Aydoğan & Kukul in 2003 in the study entitled “Analysis of Democratic Behaviors of Teachers and Lecturers” based on the studies by Atasoy (1997), Gömleksiz (1988), and Yıldırım (1994). The questionnaire included 24 items and scoring for each item was made as shown (Never: 1; Rarely: 2; Sometimes: 3; Frequently: 4; Always: 5). For the reliability of the questionnaire, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient was calculated and found to be 0,829.

The data of the study was evaluated with using SPSS 13.0 statistical package program. Taking the aims of the study into consideration, the frequencies and distributions of the data were examined.

Findings and interpretation

When the answers given to personal information were examined, it appeared that 53.3 % of the teachers were females and 46.7 % were males. Taking the marital statuses of the teachers, it appeared that 93.3 % of them were

married and 6.7 % were single. While 93.3 % of the teachers had children, 6.7 % of them had no children. 90 % of those with children had 1-3 child/ren, 3.3 % of them had 4–6 children. When the educational statuses of the teachers were examined, it appeared that 3.3 % of them were the graduates of primary teacher’s training school, 50 % of them had associate degrees and 46.7 % of them had bachelor’s degrees.

Table 1. *Distributions of the teachers according to the variables of age and length of service*

Age	f	%	Service period	f	%
26-30	2	3,3	0-5	1	1,7
31-35	6	10	6-10	5	8,3
36-40	18	30	11-15	14	23,3
41-45	14	23,3	16-20	14	23,3
46-50	14	23,3	21-25	23	38,3
51 and over	6	10	25 and over	3	5
Total	60	100	Total	60	100

As seen in Table 1, 30 % of the teachers are aged between 36–40 years, 23.3 % of them are aged between 41–45 years, 23.3 % of them are aged between 46–50 years, 10 % of them are aged between 31–35 years, 10 % of them are aged 51 years and over and 3.3 % of them are aged between 26–30 years. While 38.3 % of the teachers have a service period of 21–25 years, 23.3 % of them have 11–15 years, 23.3 % have 16–20 years, 8.3 % have 6–10 years, 5 % have more than 21-25 years and 1.7 % has 0–5 year/s of service period.

As for the socio-economic statuses of the districts where the schools in which the teachers work are situated, since no random sampling was made, a distribution of 33.3 % is observed among all the schools with low, mid and high socio-economic statuses.

In the light of the data obtained, the democratic attitude scores obtained by the teachers were found to be 103 in average, 118 at the highest, and 84 at the lowest. When the fact that “120” is the highest score which can be obtained from the questionnaire is taken into consideration, the mean of the democratic attitude scores of the teachers indicates that the teachers exhibit democratic behaviors “frequently”. The analyses made to achieve the second aim of the study indicate that there is no relationship between attitude scores and the length of service.

When the answers given to the items were examined one by one, it appeared that the answer “never” was given to the item “Using the response by the class to an unwanted behavior as a sanction power” most frequently with a percentage of 13,3. The item to which the answer “always” was most frequently given with a percentage of 66,7 was the item “Resorting to student voting about matters requiring a co-decision by the class”.

Examination of democratic attitudes of teachers according to some variables

The findings obtained following the examination of the relationship between the teachers' graduation levels and their answers to the items are as below:

Following the “cross-tabulation” and “chi-square” analyses made between the information included in the personal information form and some items of the questionnaire, there appeared a significant relationship between the answers given to the item “Abstinence to blame students for their thoughts” and the teachers' graduation levels. 50 % of the teachers who are the graduates of primary teacher's training school marked “never” and 50 % marked “frequently”; 3.3 % of those who have an associate degree marked “sometimes”, 43.3 of them marked “frequently” and 53.3 % marked “always”;

3.57 % of those who have a bachelor’s degree marked “never”, 46.4 % of them marked “frequently” and 50 % marked “always”.

Table 2. Findings indicating the relationship between the given answers to the item “Making your students feel that their thoughts are valued, cared or accepted” and the teachers’ graduation levels

Graduation level	Making your Students Feel that their Thoughts are Valued, Cared or Accepted			Total
	Frequently	Sometimes	Always	
Primary teacher’s training school	1 %50	0	1 %50	2 %100
Associate Degree	0 2	14 %46,6	16 53,3	30 %100
Bachelor	7,14 %7,14	6 %21,4	20 %71,4	28 %100

A relationship was observed between the answers given to the item “Making your students feel that their thoughts are valued, cared or accepted” and the teachers’ graduation levels. 50 % of the teachers who are the graduates of primary teacher’s training school marked “sometimes” and 50 % of them marked “always”; 46.7 % of those who have an associate degree marked “frequently” and 53.3 % of them marked “always”; 7.14 % of those who have a bachelor’s degree marked “sometimes”, 21.4 % of them marked “frequently” and 71.4 % marked “always”.

When we examined the answers given to the item “Abstinence to reveal personal information about students”, we found a significant difference with respect to their graduation levels. It was found that 50 % of the teachers who are the graduates of primary teacher’s training school marked “rarely” and 50 % of them marked “always”; 43.3 of those who have an associate degree marked “frequently” and 56.6 % of them marked “always”; 3.57 % of those

who have a bachelor's degree marked "sometimes", 28.57 % marked "frequently" and 67.8 % marked "always".

The findings obtained following the examination of the relationship between the socio-economic statuses of the schools in which the teachers work and their answers to the items are as below:

Table 3. Findings Indicating the relationship between the given answers to the item "Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students" and the socio-economic statuses of the schools

Socio-Economic Statuses	Determining the Rules to be Obeyed at School and in the Classroom together with Students				Total
	Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always	
Low		5	5	10	20
		%25	%25	%50	%100
Middle	2	3	11	4	20
	%10	%15	%55	%20	%100
High			10	10	20
			%50	%50	100
Total					

When the answers given to the item "Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students" were examined with respect to the socio-economic statuses of the schools in which the teachers work, it was observed that 25 % of the teachers from low socio-economic group marked "sometimes", 25 % marked "frequently" and 50 % marked "always"; 10 % of the teachers from middle socio-economic group marked "rarely", 15 % marked "sometimes", 55 % marked "frequently" and 20 % marked "always"; 50 % of those from high socio-economic group marked "frequently" and 50 % marked "always". Following the analysis made in relation to the socio-economic statuses of the schools in which the teachers work,

it was observed that the teachers' answers did not vary significantly with respect to the school in which they work.

The findings obtained following the examination of the relationship between the gender of the teachers and their answers to the items are as below:

According to another cross-tabulation analysis, 90.7 % of the female teachers marked “frequently” and “always” for the item “Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students”, and 75 % of the male teachers marked “frequently” and “always”, and therefore, the result was observed to be in favor of the male teachers.

The relationship between the democratic attitude scores of the teachers and their gender was determined by using t-test and no relationship was found, so much so that the mean of the attitude scores of the male teachers was 100, 9 while that of the female teachers was 101, 8.

The findings indicating the relationship between the age of the teachers and their answers to the items are as below:

Table 4. Findings indicating the relationship between the answers given to the item “Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands” and the age of the teachers

Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands						
Age		Rarely	Sometimes	Frequently	Always	Total
26-30	f	1	0	1	0	2
	%	50	0	50	0	100
31-35	f	0	3	3	0	6
	%	0	50	50	0	100
36-40	f	0	4	7	7	18

	%	0	22,2	38,9	38,9	100
41-45	f	0	3	8	3	14
	%	0	21,4	57,1	21,4	100
46-50	f	0	0	12	2	14
	%	0	0	85,7	14,3	100
51 ve üzeri	f	0	1	4	1	6
	%	0	16,7	66,7	16,7	100

Whether there is a relationship between the age of the teachers and their answers to the items was examined and it was found that the result obtained with respect to the item “Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands” was in favor of the teachers whose ages ranged between 46-50 years.

The answers given to the item “Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students” indicated that the teachers aged between 31–35 years, 46–50 years, and 51 years and over marked the alternatives “frequently” and “always” more than those from the other age groups.

Another significant difference was observed between the answers given to the item “Holding a classroom discussion and making a co-decision about the possible reason(s) for a behavior exhibited by a student or some students against the determined school or classroom rules”. For this item, a result was found in favor of the teachers aged between 31–35 and 36–40 years. However, no significant relationship was found between the ages of the teachers and their attitude scores.

The findings indicating the relationship between the marital statuses of the teachers and their answers to the items are given below:

Following the “chi-square” analysis made with respect to marital statuses of the teachers, a result was found in favor of the married ones mark-

ing the alternatives “frequently” and “always” for the item “Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands” with a difference of 32 %. According to the result of another analysis, a result was obtained in favor of the married teachers marking the alternatives “frequently” and “always” for the item “Abstinence to blame students for their thoughts” with a difference of 21.4 %. The result was in favor of the married teachers with a difference of 25 % for the item “Spending effort to have students respect to others’ thoughts”.

From the analysis made, the result was found to be again in favor of the married teachers marking the alternatives “frequently” and “always” for the item “Resorting to student voting about matters requiring a co-decision by the class” with a difference of 23 %. When their marital statuses were examined, it was found that 56 % of the teachers were married and 4 % were single and no significant difference was found between their attitude scores. Also, no significant difference was found in terms of the number of brothers or sisters they have.

The findings indicating the relationship between having children statuses of the teachers and their answers to some of the items are as below:

From the results obtained from the study, it appeared that the teachers having children were observed to mark the alternatives “frequently” and “always” with a difference of 35.8 % for the item “Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students”, with a difference of 21.4 % for the item “Abstinence to blame students for their thoughts”, with a difference of 25 % for the item “Spending effort to have students respect to others’ thoughts”, with a difference of 35.7 % for the item “Holding a classroom discussion and making a co-decision about the possible reason(s) for a behavior exhibited by a student or some students against the determined

school or classroom rules”, with a difference of 66 % for the item “Taking into consideration the opinions and suggestions of the students who are few in number in the classroom and opening a discussion on them”, and finally with a difference of 23 % for the item “Resorting to student voting about matters requiring a co-decision by the class”. And this indicates that having children status has a positive effect on having a democratic attitude and this might be related to the fact that teachers who are “mothers” or “fathers” are capable of establishing a rapport with their students, and also they behave towards them as they do to their own children.

Following the results obtained in favor of the teachers with children, another analysis was made considering the number of children they have. The results obtained through this analysis are as below: The result(s) obtained for the item “Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands” were in favor of those with 1–3 children, for the item “Abstinence to blame students for their thoughts” were in favor of those with 4–6 children, for the item “Spending effort to have students respect to others’ thoughts” were in favor of those with 4–6 children, for the item “Holding a classroom discussion and making a co-decision about the possible reason(s) for a behavior exhibited by a student or some students against the determined school or classroom rules” were in favor of those with 1–3 children, for the item “Taking into consideration the opinions and suggestions of the students who are few in number in the classroom and opening a discussion on them” were in favor of those with 1–3 children, and for the item “Resorting to student voting about matters requiring a co-decision by the class” were in favor of those with 4–6 children.

For another purpose of the study, the analysis indicating the relationship between the service length of the teachers and their answers to the items was also examined, but no significant result was obtained.

Conclusion and suggestions

Let us summarize the results obtained: (1) The mean of the democratic attitude scores obtained by the teachers was 103 out of 120, the highest score that could be obtained from the democratic attitude questionnaire, and the highest score obtained by the teachers was 118 and the lowest one was 84. Based on this, it can be concluded that the democratic attitude scores of the teachers are high; (2) The democratic attitude scores of the teachers varied for some items depending on their graduation levels. The answer “always” to the item “Abstinence to blame students for their thoughts” was given mostly by those having an associate degree, the same to the item “Making your students feel that their thoughts are valued, cared or accepted” was given mostly by those having a bachelor’s degree, and lastly to the item “Abstinence to reveal personal information about students” mostly by those having a bachelor’s degree; (3) When the relationship between the gender of the teachers and their answers to the item “Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with Students” was examined, the result was found to be in favor of the female teachers. The analysis made with respect to the age of the teachers yielded results in favor of those aged between 46-50 years for the item “Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands”, and in favor of those aged between 31-35 years for the items “Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students” and “Holding a classroom discussion and making a co-decision about the possible reason(s) for a behavior exhibited by a student or some students against the determined school or classroom rules”; (4) The relationship between the teachers’ answers and their marital statuses showed itself in the results found to be in favor of the married ones for the items “Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands”, “Abstinence to blame students for their thoughts”, “Spending effort to have students

respect to others' thoughts", and "Resorting to student voting about matters requiring a co-decision by the class".

When the teachers were compared according to their having children statuses, the results were found to be in favor of those with children with a difference of 35.8 % for the item "Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students", with a difference of 21.4 % for the item "Abstinence to blame students for their thoughts", with a difference of 25 % for the item "Spending effort to have students respect to others' thoughts", with a difference of 35.7 % for the item "Holding a classroom discussion and making a co-decision about the possible reason(s) for a behavior exhibited by a student or some students against the determined school or classroom rules", with a difference of 66 % for the item "Taking into consideration the opinions and suggestions of the students who are few in number in the classroom and opening a discussion on them", and with a difference of 23 % for the item "Resorting to student voting about matters requiring a co-decision by the class"; (5) A relationship was found between the socio-economic statuses of the schools in which the teachers work and the answers given to the item "Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students". The answer "always" was given mostly by the teachers working in the schools with "high" socio-economic level.

Based on the findings obtained from this study, the following suggestions can be offered: i) Since teachers are one of the most important factors in the process of having students internalize democracy, firstly they themselves should internalize democracy and be aware of the fact that they should act as a model; ii) The fact that teachers should appreciate students' thoughts and include them in the decision-making process in the classroom can be emphasized; iii) The teacher should not determine the classroom rules by himself or herself, instead he or she should determine them together with students and he or she should obey the determined rules as well. The rules determined by the

teacher himself or herself are usually perceived by most students as the prohibitions that can be violated; iv) This study made with classroom teachers can be made with branch teachers as well, and the relationship between the democratic attitude scores of classroom teachers and those of branch teachers can be examined.

REFERENCES

- Aydođan, İ. & Kukul, F. (2003) Öğretmenler ile Öğretim Üyelerinin Demokratik Davranışlarının Analizi. *Eurasian J. Educational Research*. Issue 11.
- Atasoy, A. (1997). İlköğretim ikinci Kademedeki Demokrasi Eğitimi ve İlköğretim İkinci Kademe Öğretmen ve Öğrencilerinin Demokratik Tutum ve Davranışlarının Karşılaştırmalı Olarak İncelenmesi”, A.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*.
- Başar, H. (2004). *Sınıf Yönetimi*. Ankara: Pegem Yayınları.
- Büyükkaragöz, S. & Üre, Ö. (1994). Öğretmen Yetiştiren Yüksek Öğretim Kurumlarındaki Öğrencilerin Demokratik Tutumlarının Araştırılması. *Demokrasi Gündemi*, TDV. Vakfı Bülteni, S. 19.
- Çağlar, D. (1997). Demokrasi Ve Eğitim. *Çağdaş Eğitim Dergisi*, S.14.
- Dođanay, A. (2000). Yaratıcı Öğrenme. *Sınıfta Demokrasi*, Eğitimsen Yayını,, s. 171–207.
- Genç, S.Z. (2006) Demokratik Kazanımların Gerçekleştirilmesinde İlköğretim Öğretmenlerinin Etkililiklerinin Değerlendirilmesi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, sy.171.
- Gömlüksiz, M. (1988). Demokratik Bir Sınıf Ortamı Açısından Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Öğretim Elemanlarının Ve Öğrencilerinin

- Davranışlarının Değerlendirilmesi. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Ankara.
- Gözütok, F.D. (1995). *Öğretmenlerin Demokratik Tutumları*. TDV Yayınları.
- Kepanekçi, Y. (2006). Demokratik Okul. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, S.11.
- Küçükahmet, L. (1989). *Demokrasi Eğitiminde Boyutlar ve Sorunları Demokrasi İçin Eğitim*. TED Yayınları, Ankara.
- Mabaçoğlu, M. (1998). Demokrasi Eğitimi Nasıl Olmalıdır? 7. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi, Cilt 2, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları*, Konya.
- San, C. (1985). Gençlik Ve Demokrasi Eğitimi. *Gençliğin Eğitimi Ve Sorunları*. TED Yayınları, Ankara.
- Ulusavaş, M. (1998). Demokrasi için Eğitim. 7. *Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi*, Cilt 2, Selçuk Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları, Konya.
- Yeşil, R. (2002). *İnsan Hakları Ve Demokrasi Eğitiminde Okul Ve Aile Ortamı*. Nobel Yayınevi.
- Yıldırım, L. (1994). İlköğretim Birinci Kademe Öğretmenlerinin Demokratik Tutum Ve Davranışları İle Öğrencilerin Demokratik Davranışları Arasındaki İlişkilerin Saptanması. *Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*. Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Ankara.

✉ Dr. Selma Güleç (corresponding author)
Ezgi Gizem Balçık
Faculty of Education
Uludağ University, 16059 Bursa, Turkey
E-Mail: sgulec@uludag.edu.tr
E-Mail: ezgizem_41@hotmail.com

APPENDIX

Answers given by the classroom teachers to the items indicating their democratic attitudes (first figure: number; second figure: percent)

1. Encouraging all students to participate in classroom and other group activities: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (3,5); frequently (38, 63.3); always (19,31);
2. Resorting to students' opinions while selecting objectives, contents, methods and toola for the lessons taught in the classroom and other group activities: never (0,0); rarely (2, 3.3); sometimes (15, 25); frequently (36, 60); always (7, 11.7);
3. Providing students with group work in classroom demonstrations and other group activities in accordance with their demands: never (0,0); rarely (1, 1.7); sometimes (11, 18.3); frequently (35, 58.3); always (13, 21.7);
4. Resorting to students' opinions for the arrangement of seating in the classroom: never (1,1.7); rarely (5, 8.3); sometimes (16, 26.7); frequently (25, 41.7); always (13, 21.7);
5. Determining the rules to be obeyed at school and in the classroom together with students: never (0,0); rarely (2, 3.3); sometimes (8, 13.3); frequently (26, 43.3); always (24, 40);
6. Asking students for their opinions while determining the kinds and dates of exams: never (0,0); rarely (6,10); sometimes (17, 28.3); frequently (24, 40); always (13, 21.7);
7. Referring to classroom activities, obeying the decisions made by the majority of the class: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (10, 16.7); frequently (41, 68.3); always (9, 18);

8. Instead of telling students what is right and what is wrong and having them do it, guiding them to generate their own ideas: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (2, 3.3); frequently (37, 61.7); always (21, 35);
9. Enabling students to evaluate events objectively and critically: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (5, 8.3); frequently (35, 58.3); always (20, 33.3);
10. Providing students with the opportunity to express their own opinions freely under no effect: never (1, 1.7); rarely (0,0); sometimes (1, 1.7); frequently (23, 38.3); always (35, 58.3);
11. Abstaining to blame students for their opinions: never (2, 3.3); rarely (0,0); sometimes (1, 1.7); frequently (27, 45); always (30, 50);
12. Welcoming students' advocating their own thoughts against yours with maturity: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (3,5); frequently (24, 40); always (33, 55);
13. Making your students feel that their thoughts are valued, cared or accepted: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (3, 5); frequently (20, 33.3); always (37, 61.7);
14. Encouraging students to express their opinions on the matter about which they know less or nothing: never (0,0); rarely (2, 3.3); sometimes (23, 38.3); always (33, 55);
15. Waiting for students to complete what they are saying even if it is wrong: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (1, 1.7); frequently (28, 46.7); always (31, 51.7);
16. Spending effort to have students respect to others' thoughts: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (1, 1.7); frequently (20, 33.3); always (39, 65);

17. Holding a classroom discussion and making a co-decision about the possible reason(s) for a behavior exhibited by a student or some students against the determined school or classroom rules: never (0,0); rarely (2, 3.3); sometimes (8, 13.3); frequently (30, 50); always (20, 33.3);
18. Using the response by the class to an unwanted behavior as a sanction power: never (8, 13.3); rarely (6, 10); sometimes (13, 21.7); frequently (27, 45); always (6, 10);
19. Taking into consideration the opinions and suggestions of the students who are few in number in the classroom and opening a discussion on them: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (8, 13.3); frequently (34, 56.7); always (18, 30);
20. Resorting to student voting about matters requiring a co-decision by the class (e.g., electing the class president): never (0,0); rarely (1, 1.7); sometimes (1, 1.7); frequently (18, 30); always (40, 66.7);
21. Letting students use their rights to vote by secret ballot: never (0,0); rarely (2,3.3); sometimes (8, 30); frequently (17, 28.3); always (33, 55);
22. Allocating time for the discussion of a current event that happened in the classroom with the lesson to be performed: never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (5, 8.3); frequently (30, 50); always (25, 41.7);
23. Taking students' views while making a classroom arrangement (hanging paintings or pictures on a wall): never (0,0); rarely (0,0); sometimes (11, 18.3); frequently (30, 50); always (19, 31.7);
24. Abstention to reveal personal information about students: never (0, 0); rarely (1,1.7); sometimes (1, 1.7); frequently (21, 35); always (37, 61.7).