

Full Length Research Paper

## Prospective teachers' values in Turkish context

Halil İbrahim KAYA

Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty of Education, Kafkas University, Turkey.

Received 25 June, 2015; Accepted 24 July, 2015

Despite the widespread of democracy, the term has no unified meaning; and thus a lack of clarity which renders communication ineffective. Democracy is a political term which allows individuals the freedom of choice when electing government officials. It gives individuals the most involvement in government oversight, elections and changes, as opposed to other forms of governance. However, this study focuses on the freedom of choice within a classroom setting. A recent definition of democracy enables individuals to have more freedom and ability in society along with their identities. Thus it ultimately leads to a more peaceful and prolific lives as individuals are integrated with their society. During this study, the survey model was used to determine the democratic values of the prospective teachers in the fourth year students from faculty of different departments in a Turkish state university. The study carried out with survey models aims to describe the specifications of the mass and the present situation. The research group is a total 402 prospective teachers studying in the Department of Preschool Teaching (n = 41), Guidance and Counseling (n = 41), Social Studies Teaching (n = 75), Science Teaching (n = 60), Primary School Teaching (n = 108), Turkish Teaching (n = 77) in the faculty of education. As an instrument, 'Democratic Values Scale' by Selvi is used to collect the data. The likert-type scale consists of 24 items, including three sub-dimensions with its factor load values ranging from .41 to .72. The sum variance explained by sub-dimensions is 44.81 %. These have shown that the validity of this scale is high. From the findings, we could say this study is so important to demonstrate in different way and approach that there is a democratically well-equipped and planned doctrine and philosophy of education in Turkey. In turn, this reflects on teachers, class, and practically prospective students. In conclusion, the study found that there is in place a democratically well-equipped and planned doctrine and philosophy of education in Turkey. This was found at the student and teacher level, as well as within the prospective student population.

**Key words:** Teacher education, value, and democratic value.

### INTRODUCTION

Despite the widespread usage of the term democracy, it has no unified meaning; therefore, there is a lack of clarity that makes it difficult to effectively communicate (Hay, 2006; Delos, 1945). In a broader sense; democracy refers to a way of life and it could only be learned by

experience; namely, this experience initially begins in the family where the individuals could participate in decision-making process. Looking at it from another perspective, democracy refers to life styles of individuals regarding their opinions, perceptions, expectations, and experiences

E-mail: hik\_kaya@hotmail.com.

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

while being members of a social group (Dewey, 1916). A recent definition of democracy is enabling individuals to have more freedom and more ability to position themselves in society with their identities, and thus it ultimately leads to a more peaceful and prolific life as individuals are integrated with their world and society (Karpát, 2010).

Similar to democracy, it is equally difficult to define education in a way that is universally agreed upon because every country develops its system of education to express and promote its unique socio-cultural identity, and also to meet the challenges of the times. Yet, in terms of sociological foundation of education, it is an overall accumulation and process in which an individual could achieve the personal development, skills, attitudes, and values in a society (Ergün, 1994). In this sense, schools should be considered to be institutions more than what they teach to students yet provide an environment to socialize students to make them think, to learn, un-learn and re-learn (Koliba, 2008). In this socialization process, students are expected to receive such education and values regarding democracy that is “a democratizing force that helps to prepare students to participate actively in all aspects of democratic life” (Pandey, 2005:72)

Democratic values have fundamental roles in individuals' life experiences, and in their interactions with the social groups they belong to. Values play an important role in the informal relationships in a society although laws regulate the official and formal relations (Duman et al, 2001: 8-11). Values should be taught in countries governed by democracy. Respect and responsibility could create a democratic society (Lickona, 1992). In this sense, incorporation of democratic principles, understanding and teaching could be realized through the democratic values in a country. Teaching democratic values increases awareness of respecting others, gaining responsibilities, being honest, and living in a society peacefully (Veugelers and Kat, 2003).

Dobozy (2007) states that schools and teachers starting from primary schools stipulate students about democratic values; and they may be fortified to gain the skills to construct their own personal point of views about these abstract concepts based on their life experiences. Students have the opportunity to gain democratic values such as equality, freedom, and justice in a school atmosphere where their teachers have always questioned how to help students indigenize the values, but not solely subjects of the study (Topkaya and Yavuz, 2011). Therefore, the teacher's role is highly significant in the future of a nation by shaping the minds of youths as the architects of the future generation (Subba, 2014: 38). The connection between education and democracy is considered to be important, as “an entire philosophy of government has seen increased education as the basic requirement of democracy” (Dahl et al., 2003; 57).

Democratic education is a process through which the principles and rules of democracy, the human rights, and freedoms are taught to young people of a society by converting these values into explicit or implicit goals in the curricula through learning experiences. The aim of democratic education is to educate citizens with independent, inquisitive and analytical overview to the world, and thoroughly familiar with the application of the rules of democracy, as well (Karakütük, 2001).

Having good implementation of democratic values in the curriculum program is the utmost important in terms of value, ability, and cornerstone in terms of teachers and their roles. In this context, the values have an important place in teacher's professional life and understanding their students, and students' values themselves.

The most important function of a democratic education is to improve the long-established idea of democracy in the human mind and to make democracy a natural form in human behavior and thoughts. Therefore, democratic education equates to “democratic order”. According to Dewey; an ideal democracy demands the social responsibilities of the political life and a public, who have a high level education and responsibility consciousness enough (Guttek, 2001:217). Education in a free society awakens and develops the consciousness of democratic life, and allows the public to participate effectively in democratic life (Burton, 1968; cited by Gözütok, 2004: 210).

Democracy and/or democratic values are leading concepts and rhetorically power for Turkey and have much importance all over the world; but the influence of these concepts over practice in educational settings has been difficult to measure. The current literature on democratic education in Turkish context has indicated that there have been several approaches to the value of education, such as the value of teachers in the curricula, the place of teacher in the value of education, and the approaches used to develop the skills of value were among the most discussed subjects in which “teacher” and “values” alike were discussed (Akbaş, 2004; 2009; Akkiprik, 2007; Baloğlu and Balgalmış, 2005; Can, 2008; Çengelci, 2010 Doğanay and Sarı, 2004; Demir and Demirhan, 2007; Deveci and Dal, 2007; Fidan, 2009; Koç, 2007; Kuş, 2009; Özen, 2008; Sarı, 2007; Şen, 2007; Tokdemir, 2007; Yalar, 2010; Yıldırım, 2009).

Democratic values and attitudes of teachers have an impact on teachers' decisions and practices (Topkaya and Yavu, 2011). In a study, Topkaya and Yavu (2011) investigated democratic values and teacher self-efficacy perceptions of 294 pre-service English teachers in the Turkish context. Results indicated that they gained very high democratic values but there was no significant differences based on gender. Further, democratic values are correlated with self-efficacy perceptions. This study has focused on two different but practically integrated

**Table 1.** The sub-dimensions of scale and total reliability analysis.

Name of sub-dimension	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
1. Right to Education	9	,890
2. Solidarity	9	,866
3. Freedom	6	,704
4. Factor-Sum Scale	24	,892

aspects with regard to what is taught as the value of democracy and how it is taught in a teaching environment. The present research gives a special emphasis to the notion of democratic classroom environment while teaching democratic values. Specifically, this paper aims to examine prospective teachers' democratic values in Turkish education context.

## METHOD

### Research design

This study is a descriptive study in which a survey model was utilized to determine the democratic values of the prospective teachers in the fourth year from the different departments of a faculty of education in a Turkish state university. The studies were carried out with survey models and were aimed to determine and describe the specifications of the mass and the present situation (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012).

### Research group

The research group is a total 402 prospective teachers studying in Department of Preschool Teaching (n = 41), Guidance and Counseling (n = 41), Social Studies Teaching (n = 75), Science Teaching (n = 60), Primary School Teaching (n = 108), Turkish Teaching (n = 77) in the faculty of education.

### Instrument

'Democratic Values Scale' developed by Selvi (2006) was used to collect the data. The likert-type scale consists of 24 items, including three sub-dimensions and its factor load values range from .41 to .72. The sum variance explained by sub-dimensions is 44.81%. These have shown that the validity of this scale is high. The first sub-dimension, which is 'Right to Education', contains nine items and its variance is 17.74%. The second sub-dimension, which is 'Solidarity', similarly contains nine items and its variance is 15.83%. The third sub-dimension, 'Freedom' contains six items and its variance 11.24%. Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of the scale is .87; the first sub-dimension is .84; the second sub-dimension is .82; the third sub-dimension is .70. Sum of correlations of the items ranges from .25 to .62. The higher points in the scale indicate that prospective teachers have a high level of participation to democratic values (Selvi, 2006: 1174-1176).

In this study, the scale reliability co-efficiency and co-efficiencies of the sub-dimensions are presented in Table 1.

The reliability analyses were performed to examine reliability level of the scale and its sub-levels. The results showed that the Cronbach alpha values are over .70, indicating that the scale is

reliable. Cronbach's Alpha of the scale is 892. Cronbach's Alpha values for the sub-levels are: for the freedom sub-level is, 704, for the solidarity.866, and for the Right to Education is .890.

## RESULTS

A series of inferential statistics were conducted to examine significant differences among department, mode of education and gender and the levels of the scale. The results are presented in Table 2.

### The analysis of total points of the scale

Table 2 shows ANOVA statistics that were performed to examine significant differences among departments. The results showed that there was no significant differences among students who attend different departments [F (5,396)=1 .758,  $p > 0.05$ ], indicating that students' departments do not impact their democratic values. The highest mean score was obtained for preschool education department students ( $\bar{X} = 100,48$ ) while the lowest mean score was obtained for psychological counseling and guidance department students ( $\bar{X} = 94,14$ ). Table 3 shows the t-test analyses that were conducted to examine significant differences between day group students and evening group students regarding their democratic values. The results indicated that there was no significant difference [t (399) = 1.078,  $p = .281$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. The mean scores were similar across groups; the mean score obtained for day group students is ( $\bar{X} = 98,48$ ) while the mean score obtained for the evening group is ( $\bar{X} = 97,18$ ).

Table 4 shows the t-test analyses that were conducted to examine significant differences between male and female students regarding their democratic values. The results indicated that there was no significant difference [t (399) = .410,  $p = .682$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. The mean score for males is ( $\bar{X} = 98,30$ ) while for females is ( $\bar{X} = 97,18$ ).

### Inferential statistics regarding the sub-dimension named "Right to Education"

Table 5 shows ANOVA statistics that were performed to

**Table 2.** One-Way ANOVA results for the departments to determine the democratic values of prospective teachers according to total points.

Scale	Departments	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p
Sum Dimension	Preschool Teaching	41	100,48	10,78	Between Groups	1175,622	5	235,124	1,758	,120
	Guidance & Counseling	41	94,14	14,71	Within Group	52960,480	396	133,739		
	Social Studies	75	96,60	12,43	Total	54136,102	401			
	Science Teaching	60	98,36	8,56						
	Primary School Teaching	108	99,15	9,80	Significant Difference					
	Turkish Teaching	77	98,42	13,36						
	Total	402	98,04	11,61						

**Table 3.** T-test results for the mode of education to determine the democratic values of prospective teachers according to total points.

Scale	Mode of education	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	p
Sum Scale Dimension	Day	258	98,48	10,66987			
	Evening	143	97,18	13,16773	399	1,078	,281
	Total	401					

**Table 4.** T-test results for gender to determine the democratic values of prospective teachers according to *Total Points*.

Scale	Gender	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	p
Sum Scale Dimension	Female	231	97,81	12,54286	399	,410	,682
	Male	170	98,30	10,27138			
	Total	401					

**Table 5.** One Way ANOVA results for the prospective teachers' values about "*Right to Education*" according to the departments.

Scale	Departments	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p
Right to Education	Preschool Teaching	41	40,3171	5,75082	Between Groups	312,976	5	62,595	2,015	,076
	Guidance & Counseling	41	37,4146	6,85557	Within Group	12302,357	396	31,067		
	Social Studies	75	39,2133	5,95545	Total	12615,333	401			
	Science Teaching	60	40,3833	4,32216						
	Primary School Teaching	108	40,2778	4,46551	Significant Difference					
	Turkish Teaching	77	39,5455	6,52837						
	Total	402	39,6667	5,60889						

examine significant differences between the students' Right to Education and values based on their departments. The results showed that there were no significant differences among students from different departments [F(5,396)=2 .015, p>0.05]. The highest mean score was obtained for preschool education

department students ( $\bar{X}$  =40,38) while the lowest mean score was obtained for psychological counseling and guidance department students in Right to Education level ( $\bar{X}$  =37,41).

Table 6 shows the t-test analyses that were conducted

**Table 6.** T-test results for mode of education in the *Right to Education* level.

Scale	Mode of education	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	P
Right to Education	Day	258	39,9419	5,20331	399	1,385	,167
	Evening	143	39,1329	6,26216			
	Total	258	39,9419	5,20331			

**Table 7.** T-test results for male and female students' values in the *Right to Education* level.

Scale	Gender	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	P
Right to Education	Female	231	39,6926	6,01418	399	,163	,870
	Male	170	39,6000	5,02467			
	Total	231	39,6926	6,01418			

**Table 8.** One Way ANOVA results for the students' values about *Solidarity* according to their departments.

Scale	Departments	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	P
Solidarity	Preschool Teaching	41	38,8293	4,97947	Between Groups	272,408	5	54,482	1,860	,100
	Guidance & Counseling	41	35,9024	6,74094	Within Group	11600,159	396	29,293		
	Social Studies	75	37,6267	5,97466	Total	11872,567	401			
	Science Teaching	60	38,5833	4,14276	Significant Difference					
	Primary School Teaching	108	38,5556	4,91675						
	Turkish Teaching	77	38,1169	5,79240						
	Total	402	38,0597	5,44127						

to examine significant differences between day group students and evening group students regarding Right to Education level. The results indicated that there was no significant difference [ $t(399) = 1.385$ ,  $p = .167$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. The mean scores were similar across groups; the mean score obtained for day group students is ( $\bar{X} = 39,94$ ) while the mean score obtained for the evening group is ( $\bar{X} = 39,13$ ).

Table 7 shows the t-test analyses that were conducted to examine significant differences between male and female students regarding their "Right to Education" level. The results indicated that there was no significant difference between males and females [ $t(399) = .163$ ,  $p = .870$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. The mean score for males is ( $\bar{X} = 39,60$ ) while for females is ( $\bar{X} = 39,69$ ).

#### Inferential statistics regarding the sub-dimension named "*Solidarity*"

Table 8 shows the ANOVA analyses that were conducted

to examine significant differences among students studying in different departments and their solidarity values. The results indicated that there were no significant differences [ $F(5,396) = 1.860$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ]. The highest mean score was obtained for preschool education department students ( $\bar{X} = 38,82$ ), while the lowest mean score was obtained for psychological counseling and guidance department students in the solidarity level ( $\bar{X} = 35,90$ ).

Table 9 shows the t-test analyses that were conducted to examine significant differences between day group students and evening group students regarding solidarity. The results indicated that there was no significant difference [ $t(399) = .532$ ,  $p = .595$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. The mean scores were similar across groups; the mean score obtained for day group students is ( $\bar{X} = 38,16$ ) while the mean score obtained for the evening group is ( $\bar{X} = 37,86$ ).

Table 10 shows the t-test analyses that were conducted to examine significant differences between male and female students regarding solidarity values.

**Table 9.** T-test results for Mode of Education in the *Solidarity* level.

Scale	Mode of Education	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	P
Solidarity	Day	258	38,16	4,91213	399	,532	,595
	Evening	143	37,86	6,31297			
	Total	258	38,16	4,91213			

**Table 10.** T-test results for male and female students' values in the *Solidarity* level.

Scale	Gender	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	P
Solidarity	Female	231	20,1169	2,73452	399	1,738	,399
	Male	170	20,5824	2,53186			
	Total	231	20,4524	2,01418			

**Table 11.** One-way ANOVA results for the departments to determine the democratic values of prospective teachers according to *Freedom*.

Scale	Departments	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	sd	Mean of Squares	F	p		
Freedom	Preschool Teaching	41	21,3415	2,31959	Between Groups	143,050	5	28,610	4,214	,001		
	Guidance & Counseling	41	20,8293	2,20116	Within Group	2688,554	396	6,789				
	Social Studies	75	19,7600	2,37578	Total	2831,604	401					
	Science Teaching	60	19,4000	2,71967	Significant Difference: Preschool Teaching - Social Sciences Teaching; Preschool Teaching –Science Teaching							
	Primary School Teaching	108	20,3241	2,71661								
	Turkish Teaching	77	20,7662	2,89235								
	Total	402	20,3209	2,65732								

The results indicated that there was no significant difference [t (399) =1,738 p= .399, p > .05]. The mean score for the males is ( $\bar{X}$  =20,58) while for the females is ( $\bar{X}$  =20,11).

**Inferential statistics regarding the sub-dimension named “Freedom”**

Table 11 shows the ANOVA analyses that were conducted to examine significant differences among students studying in different departments in terms of freedom. The results indicated that there was a significant difference [F(5,396)=4 .214, p<0.05]. The highest mean score obtained for preschool education department students is ( $\bar{X}$  =21,34) while the lowest mean score was obtained for science department students in the freedom level ( $\bar{X}$  =19,40). There were significant differences among social sciences, preschool education and science education departments. In this context: on one hand; the

*Post Hoc test* is used to examine the significance differences among the group; on the other hand, *Tukey method in Post Hoc test* is used to determine the differences of groups. The results showed that there were significant differences between Preschool Teaching and Social Studies departments (p<0.05). When analyzing the differences among groups, it was seen as the arithmetical mean ( $\bar{X}$  =21,34) of Preschool Teaching and the arithmetical mean ( $\bar{X}$  =19,76) of Social Studies department. This difference seemed to be in favor of Preschool Teaching department. A significant difference between Preschool Teaching and Science Teaching departments (p<0.05) was found. When analyzing the differences among groups, it was seen as the arithmetical mean of Preschool Teaching ( $\bar{X}$  =21,34) and the arithmetical mean of Science Teaching department ( $\bar{X}$  =19,40). This difference seemed to be in favor of Preschool Teaching department. The students attending the preschool education department significantly differed from others in terms of solidarity.

**Table 12.** T-test results for mode of education in the *Freedom* level.

Scale	Mode of Education	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	P
Freedom	Day	258	20,3837	2,54073	399	,703	,482
	Evening	143	20,1888	2,86049			
	Total	258	20,3837	2,54073			

**Table 13.** T-test results for male and female students' values in the *Freedom* level.

Scale	Gender	N	Mean	SS	Sd	t	P
Freedom	Female	231	20,11	2,73	399	1,738	,083
	Male	170	20,58	2,53			
	Total	231	20,11	2,73			

Table 12 shows the t-test analyses that were conducted to examine significant differences between day group students and evening group students regarding freedom. The results indicated that there was no significant difference [ $t(399) = .703, p = .482, p > .05$ ]. The mean scores were similar across groups; the mean score that was obtained for day group students is ( $\bar{X} = 20,38$ ) while the mean score that was obtained for the evening group is ( $\bar{X} = 20,18$ )

Table 13 shows the t-test results conducted to examine significant differences between male and female students regarding freedom. The results indicated that there was no significant difference [ $t(399) = 1.738, p = .083, p > .05$ ]. The mean score for the males is ( $\bar{X} = 20,58$ ) while for the females is ( $\bar{X} = 20,11$ ).

## DISCUSSION

This paper reached the following results: First, this study showed that there were no significant differences among departments based on the total scores [ $F(5,396) = 1.758, p > 0.05$ ]. This result was supported by a study of Sadık and Sarı (2011) who found that the teacher candidates are well aware of the democratic values. This result may give the impression that it is important for social sciences undergraduate students to exhibit behaviors related to democratic values. Taken up by teachers doing the courses for democratic values, it seems that the teachers have democratic values of academics; there is a significant relationship among them if there can be examined taking into account a variety of variables (Yazıcı, 2011). Akın and Özdemir (2009) found no significant differentiation in solidarity and freedom levels. However, Gömleksiz and Kan (2008) found a significant

difference in terms of democratic attitudes of the teacher candidate students. Democratic attitudes of the social sciences teacher candidates were higher than the science teacher candidates. The discrepancy between the two studies may stem from the absence of the science education program students. Further, Aydemir and Aksoy (2010) found a significant difference between the department and democratic attitudes. Aydemir and Aksoy (2010) also found significant differences among the teacher candidates departments and their democratic attitudes.

Second, the mode of education (e.g. day or evening) did not impact the students' democratic values [ $t(399) = 1.078, p = .281, p > .05$ ].

Third, males and females do not significantly differ in the democratic values [ $t(399) = .410, p = .682, p > .05$ ]. There are several studies that have found mixed results. Karahan et al. (2006) found no significant differences between male and female students' democratic attitudes. In a study, Doğanay and Sari (2006) found that the perception of female students was higher than the boys yet there was no significant difference. However, there are few studies that found significant differences between male and female teachers' democratic values. For example, Akın and Özdemir (2009) found that prospective teachers' democratic values significantly differed by gender; especially their values regarding freedom and solidarity differed significantly based on gender. Some studies also found that females have a more democratic attitude than males (Gömleksiz and Kan, 2008; Karahan et al., 2006). Demoulin and Kolstad (2000) examined 1452 teacher candidates' democratic values. They found that female teachers had more democratic maturity than males. Karaman and Kepenekçi's (2006) study also indicated that female students had a more positive attitude towards children's rights. Aydemir and Aksoy

(2010) found a significant difference between democratic attitudes of students by gender. Democratic attitudes of female students were found to be more positive than male students.

Fourth, departments did not impact upon "Right to Education" values of the teacher candidates [F (5,396)=2 .015,  $p > 0.05$ ]. Yet, Preschool department students scored high in this level ( $\bar{X} = 40,31$ ) while psychological counseling and guidance department students received the lowest score ( $\bar{X} = 37,41$ ). This result was again supported by Sadık and Sarı (2011)'s study who found that teacher candidates perceive democracy as the concept of equality and freedom. Akın and Özdemir (2009) found similar results regarding teachers' values about Right to Education, solidarity and freedom. However, Gömleksiz and Kan (2008) found that social science teacher candidates significantly differed from science teacher candidates in terms of democratic attitude. The source of this difference between the two surveys may stem from the absence of the Science Education Program students in this paper. Aydemir and Aksoy (2010) similarly found that students studying at different departments differed significantly about their democratic attitudes.

Fifth, male and female students did not significantly differ in terms of Right to Education level [t (399) = .163,  $p = .870$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. In parallel to our findings; Karahan et al. (2006) found no significant difference between the teacher candidates gender and their democratic attitude. Doğanay and Sari (2006) found that although the average perception of female students higher than the average for boys, there was no significant difference at this level. However, there are several studies that found significant relations between teachers' gender and their democratic values. Akın and Özdemir (2009) found that democratic values in the education of prospective teachers by gender significantly differed; especially freedom and solidarity values of males and females differed significantly; women had more democratic attitudes toward students than males (Gömleksiz and Kan, 2008; Karahan et al., 2006). Demoulin and Kolstad (2000) investigated 1452 teacher candidates' democratic maturity. They found that female teachers had democratic maturity males. Karaman and Kepenekçi (2006)'s study also concluded that female students had a more positive attitude towards children's rights. Aydemir and Aksoy (2010) found that gender impacted upon the democratic attitude of students. Democratic attitudes of female students are more positive than male students

Sixth, there was no significant difference between mode of education and Right to Education level [t (399) = 1.385,  $p = .167$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. The mean scores were similar across groups. The former literature does not include similar results to our best knowledge; therefore this result is important for further research.

Seventh, the results indicated that there were no significant differences among students studying in different departments and their solidarity values [F (5,396)=1 .860,  $p > 0.05$ ]. The highest mean score was obtained for preschool education department students ( $\bar{X} = 38,82$ ), while the lowest mean score was obtained for psychological counseling and guidance department students in the solidarity level ( $\bar{X} = 35,90$ ). Akın and Özdemir (2009) found that there were no significant differences among teachers in terms of solidarity and freedom values. However, Gömleksiz and Kan (2008) found significant differences among teacher candidates' solidarity values. Akın and Özdemir (2009) found that there was no significant differentiation in solidarity and freedom subscale.

Eighth, the results indicated that there was no significant difference between day group students and evening group students regarding solidarity [t (399) = .532,  $p = .595$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. The mean scores were similar across groups.

Ninth, males and females did not differ significantly in terms of solidarity. [t (399) = .163,  $p = .870$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. In parallel to our findings; Karahan et al. (2006) found no significant difference between the teacher candidates' gender and their democratic attitude. Doğanay and Sari (2006) found that although the average perception of female students is higher than the average for boys, there was no significant difference at this level.

Tenth, there were significant differences among departments and freedom [F(5,396)=4 .214,  $p < 0.05$ ]. The highest mean score obtained for preschool education department students is ( $\bar{X} = 21,34$ ) while the lowest mean score was obtained for science department students in the freedom level is ( $\bar{X} = 19,40$ ).

Eleventh, there was no significant difference between solidarity and mode of education [t (399) = .703,  $p = .482$ ,  $p > .05$ ].

Twelfth, males and females did not significantly differ in terms of freedom [t (399) = 1.738,  $p = .083$ ,  $p > .05$ ]. In parallel to our findings; Karahan et al. (2006) said teacher candidates having a significant difference depending on gender in research has not been established; that they deal with the democratic attitude.

## Conclusion

The foundation of Democracy and Democratic Values have taken place in the last hundred years including the accompanying changes in political and educational doctrines since the end of the eighteenth century. When we have analyzed the constitutions of both Turkey and USA, there seems a change and continuum on the structure of constitutions, that is to say, from being Republican to becoming Democratic. In turn, by analyzing



the educational approaches and doctrines, the philosophy of education has taken fundamental steps to equally provide “Right to Education”, “Solidarity”, and “Freedom” to all students and participants in education in framework of Democratic Value in Education in the same way in which there were three fundamental steps in democracy: the abolition of slavery, the elimination of oligarchical privileges (whether claimed by birth and wealth), and with the removal of class distinctions based on color, race, and sex (Adler, 1944: 80).

Firstly, in this perspective, when we have evaluated the first findings in which there were no significant differences among departments, mode of education and genders based on the total scores [ $F(5,396)=1.758, p>0.05$ ], it could be said that the sampling departments are well aware of democratic values in their classroom in terms of department, mode of education [ $t(399)=1.078, p=.281, p>.05$ ] and genders [ $t(399)=.410, p=.682, p>.05$ ]. Namely, they could exhibit the behaviors related to democratic values with the help of academic courses and academicians having the democracy feeling and values. It could be said that the academic life and lectures are designed to the democratic sensibility and values in a planned and intentionally to remove the class distinctions based on mode of education and sex as Adler (1944) said.

Secondly, when we analyzed the findings in terms of sub-dimensions of the scale, as the same was before, it could be said that there was not a significantly different impact over the departments [ $F(5,396)=2.015, p>0.05$ ], genders [ $t(399)=.163, p=.870, p>.05$ ], and mode of education [ $t(399)=1.385, p=.167, p>.05$ ] in the democratic values in the subscale named “*Right to Education*”, furthermore, no significant impact over the genders [ $t(399)=.163, p=.870, p>.05$ ], and mode of education [ $t(399)=.703, p=.482, p>.05$ ] in the democratic values in the subscale named “*Solidarity*”. In variable named mode of education, the former literature does not include similar results to our best knowledge; therefore we could mention that this result is important for further research. In this context, the whole students from the sampling department have strong beliefs in the subscale named “*Right to Education*” and “*Solidarity*”. This has also shown that the students who graduated from these departments regardless of their mode of education and genders in the subscale named “*Right to Education*” and “*Solidarity*” have had a more positive attitude towards future children’s rights to education.

Lastly, when we analyzed the findings in terms of sub-dimensions of the scale, as the same was before, it could be said that there is significant impact on the departments [ $F(5,396)=4.214, p<0.05$ ], but no significant impact on genders [ $t(399)=1.738, p=.083, p>.05$ ] and in the democratic values in the subscale named “*Freedom*”. The notion of Freedom superseded

individual freedoms which were seen as bourgeois values meant to perpetuate the rule of the capitalist elite. The ability of regimes to distort the meanings of freedom, democracy, and equality was not a result of the naivety of the public but of brute force utilized by the various governments to impose their will, and their definitions (Abukhalil, 1997: 150). If we could evaluate the finding to reach a conclusion from this statement, the notion of freedom is supposed to depend on governmental policy and doctrines. This shows that the constitution of democratic values, including “Right to Education”, “Solidarity”, and lastly “Freedom” depend on to what extent a state and/or government has a well-established freedom notion. From this point of view, we could say this study is so important to demonstrate in different ways and approaches that there is a democratically well-equipped and planned doctrine and philosophy of education in Turkey. In turn, this reflects on teachers and class, as well as prospective students.

### Conflict of Interests

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

### REFERENCES

- Abukhalil AA (1997). Change and democratisation in the Arab world: the role of political parties. *Third World Q.* 18(1):149-163. [http://www.researchgate.net/publication/248949698\\_Change\\_and\\_democratisation\\_in\\_the\\_Arab\\_world\\_The\\_role\\_of\\_political\\_parties](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/248949698_Change_and_democratisation_in_the_Arab_world_The_role_of_political_parties)
- Adler MJ (1944). *The Theory of Democracy - Part V. The Principles of Justice: Citizenship and Suffrage.* Thomist; a Speculative Quarterly Rev. 7:80.
- Akbaş O (2004). Türk milli eğitim sisteminin duyuşsal amaçlarının ilköğretim II. kademedeki gerçekteşme derecesinin deęerlendirilmesi. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/daad/article/view/5000076976>
- Akbaş O (2009). İlköğretim okullarında görevli branş öğretmenlerinin deęer öğretimi yaparken kullandıkları etkinlikler: 2004 ve 2007 yıllarına ilişkin bir karşılaştırma. *Kastamonu Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17 (2):403-414.
- Akın U, Özdemir M (2009). Öğretmen Adaylarının Demokratik Deęerlerinin Çeşitli Deęişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi: Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Örneęi. *Ankara University, J. Faculty of Educ. Sci.* 42(2): 183-198. <http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/dergiler/40/1223/13979.pdf>
- Akkıprık GB (2007). Genel lise öğretmenlerine göre karakter eğitimi yoluyla öğrencilere kazandırılacak deęerler: Çok boyutlu bir araştırma. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Aydemir H, Aksoy DN (2010). Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Demokratik Tutumlarının Bazı Deęişkenlerle İlişkisi: Malatya Örneęi. *Erzincan Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi Cilt-Sayı:* 12-1. <http://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/131310-2012041093514-265-279.pdf>
- Baloęlu M, Balgalmış E (2005). İlköğretim ve ortaöğretim yöneticilerinin öz-deęerlerinin betimlenmesi: Tokat ili örneęi. *Deęerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3(10):19-31. <http://www.pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/287.pdf>

- Büyükdüvenci S (1990). Democracy, Education and Turkey. *Educ. Sci. J.* 23: 2.
- Büyükdüvenci S, Çakmak EK, Akgün ÖE, Karadeniz Ş, Demirel F (2012). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. (11. baskı) Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Can Ö (2008). Dördüncü ve beşinci sınıf öğretmenlerinin sosyal bilgiler dersinde değerler eğitimi uygulamalarına ilişkin görüşleri. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara. <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/esosder/article/view/5000068614>
- Çengelci T (2010). İlköğretim Beşinci Sınıf Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Değerler Eğitiminin Gerçekleştirilmesine İlişkin Bir Durum Çalışması. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir. [http://www.ijoess.com/Makaleler/591816596\\_SYasar&TCengelci.pdf](http://www.ijoess.com/Makaleler/591816596_SYasar&TCengelci.pdf)
- Demir K, Demirhan İC (2007). Hayat Bilgisi Dersinde Değerler ve Değerler Eğitimi. I. Ulusal İlköğretim Kongresi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Deveci H, Dal S (2007). Teachers view of values education in social studies curriculum. Fourteenth International Conference on Learning, 26-29 June 2007, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Dewey J (1916). *Democracy and Education, an Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey J (1985) *Democracy and Education*. In: J. Dewey, *The Middle Works, 1899 - 1924*, vol 9, ed. J. A. Boydston (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/453309>
- Dewey J (1991a). The challenge of Democracy to Education. In J. Dewey, *The Later Works, 1925 - 1953* vol. 11, ed. J. A. Boydston (Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press), pp.181 - 190.
- Dobozy E (2007). Effective learning of civic skills: democratic schools succeed in nurturing the critical capacities of students. *Educ. Stud.* 33(2):115-128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03055690601068279>
- Doğanay A, Sarı M (2004). İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerine temel demokratik değerlerin kazandırılma düzeyi ve bu değerlerin kazandırılması sürecinde açık örtük programın etkilerinin karşılaştırılması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, 10(39):355-383. <http://dergipark.ulakbim.gov.tr/kuvey/article/view/5000050729/5000047976>
- Doğanay A, Sarı M (2006). Öğrencilerin Üniversitedeki Yaşam Kalitesine İlişkin Algılarının Demokratik Yaşam Kültürü Çerçevesinde Değerlendirilmesi (Çukurova Üniversitesi Örneği). *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2). <http://www.tebd.gazi.edu.tr/index.php/tebd/article/view/33/25>
- Duman B (2009) Correlation between the Graduate-Students' Perception of Educational Philosophies and their Democratic Attitudes. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.951>
- Duman T, Karakaya N, Yavuz N (2001). *Vatandaşlık Bilgisi*. Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim ve Yayıncılık.
- Edwards CH (2008). *Classroom Discipline & Management (Fifth Edition)*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Publishers
- Ergün, M. (1994). *Eğitim Sosyolojisine Giriş. (Eğitim ve Toplum)*. Ankara: Ocak Yayıncılık.
- Fidan NK (2009). Öğretmen adaylarının değer öğretimine ilişkin görüşleri. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim*, 2 (2): 1-18. <https://pegem.net/dosyalar/dokuman/131917-2012041992825-fidan-1.pdf>
- Gözütok FD (2004). *Öğretmenliği Geliştiriyorum (2. Baskı)*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Gutok GL (2001). *Eğitimin Felsefi ve İdeolojik Temelleri (Çer.: N. Kale)*, Ankara: Ütopya Yayınevi.
- Lickona T (1992). *Educating for Character (How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility)*. New York: Bantam Books. [https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=QB1rPLf2siQC&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr&source=gbs\\_ge\\_summary\\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=QB1rPLf2siQC&printsec=frontcover&hl=tr&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Karakütük (2001). *Demokratik Laik Eğitim (Çağdaş Toplum Olmanın Yolu)*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Karpat HK (2010). *Türk demokrasi tarihi: Sosyal, kültürel, ekonomik temeller*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.
- Koç K (2007). İlköğretim 7. sınıflarda okutulan vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi dersinde öğrenciye kazandırılması amaçlanan evrensel değerlere ilişkin tutumlar üzerinde öğretim sürecinin etkisi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Koliba C (2008). *Democracy and Education Schools and Communities Initiative Conceptual Framework and Preliminary Findings*. <http://www.uvm.edu/~dewey/articles/Democonc.html>
- Kuş D (2009). İlköğretim programlarının, örtük programın ve okul dışı etmenlerin değerleri kazandırma etkililiğinin 8. sınıf ilköğretim öğrencilerinin ve öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine göre incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul. [http://www.pegem.net/Akademi/kongrebildiri\\_detay.aspx?id=125063](http://www.pegem.net/Akademi/kongrebildiri_detay.aspx?id=125063)
- Özen R (2008). İlköğretim okulu öğretmenlerinin örgütsel değerlere ilişkin görüşleri. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 8: 1-8. <http://www.efdergi.ibu.edu.tr/index.php/efdergi/article/view/985/1812>
- Tokdemir M (2007). Tarih öğretmenlerinin değerler ve değer eğitimi hakkındaki görüşleri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- Pandey VC (2005). *Democracy & Education*. Adarsh Nagar, Delhi, India: Isha Books, Mehra Offset Press. <https://books.google.com.tr/books?id=gLsz9OekyylC&pg=PP1&hl=tr&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Sarı M (2007). Demokratik değerlerin kazanımı sürecinde örtük program: düşük ve yüksek "okul yaşam kalitesi"ne sahip iki ilköğretim okulunda nitel bir çalışma. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana. <http://library.cu.edu.tr/tezler/6248.pdf>
- Subba D (2014). Democratic Values and Democratic Approach in Teaching: A Perspective. *Am. J. Educ. Res.* 2(12A):37-40. <http://pubs.sciepub.com/education/2/12A/6/>
- Şen Ü (2007). Milli Eğitim Bakanlığının 2005 yılında tavsiye ettiği 100 temel eser yoluyla Türkçe eğitiminde değerler öğretimi üzerine bir araştırma. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Topkaya EZ, Yavu A (2011). Democratic Values and Teacher Self-Efficacy Perceptions: A Case of Pre-Service English Language Teachers in Turkey. *Austr. J. Teacher Educ.* 36:32-49. <http://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1517&context=ajte>
- Tural S (1992). *Kültürel Kimlik Üzerine Düşünceler*. Ankara: Ecdad Yayınevi.
- Yalar T (2010). İlköğretim sosyal bilgiler programında değerler eğitiminin mevcut durumunun belirlenmesi ve öğretmenlere yönelik bir program modülü geliştirme. *Eğitim ve Bilim, Cilt 36 (159)*. <http://www.mitosweb.com/browse/78564/>
- Yazıcı K (2011). Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmen Adaylarının Demokratik Değerlerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Mersin Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mersin. <http://egitimvebilim.ted.org.tr/index.php/EB/article/view/373/254>
- Yıldırım A, Şimşek H (2006). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Veuglers W, Kat ED (2003). *Moral and Democratic Education in Public Primary Schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.