

JUSTICE IN SCHOOL PRACTICES: 6th AND 7th GRADE STUDENTS'
PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

TÜLAY ÇELİKKAYA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

SEPTEMBER 2008

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Doç. Dr. Oya Yerin Güneri
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and in our opinion, it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assist. Prof. Dr. Cennet Engin Demir
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Cennet Engin Demir (METU, EDS) _____

Assist. Prof. Dr. Erdiñç Çakırođlu (METU, EME) _____

Dr. Yaşar Kondakçı (METU, EDS) _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Tlay ELİKKAYA

Signature :

ABSTRACT

JUSTICE IN SCHOOL PRACTICES: 6th AND 7th GRADE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR SCHOOL EXPERIENCES

Çelikkaya, Tülay

M.S., Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Assist. Prof. Dr. Cennet Engin Demir

September 2008, 65 pages

This study aims to investigate primary school students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences and to examine whether their perceptions show significant differences with respect to certain background variables.

The sample of this study consisted of 526 students from seven primary schools in different neighborhoods in Ankara.

The data was gathered through a questionnaire developed by the researcher in order to measure the students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed for the analysis of the data. The principal component analysis extracted four dimensions of justice, namely distributive justice, interactional justice, procedural justice and retributive justice. The results of the repeated measures analysis indicated that dimensions can be listed from the most fair to least fair as procedural justice, retributive justice, interactional justice and distributive justice. Students perceived their schools' practices most fair with respect to procedural justice and retributive justice.

The results of the MANOVA indicated that gender and achievement level has significant effect on students' perceptions of justice. Compared to males, female students perceived their school experiences more fair. Results also revealed that compared to low achievers, high achievers perceived their school environment more fair with respect to retributive justice.

Principals and teachers should pay attention to the distribution of the grades, praises, punishment, since students perceived their school practices least fair with respect to distributive justice.

Keywords: Justice, Perceived Justice, Values Education, Citizenship Education, Democratic Education

ÖZ

OKUL UYGULAMALARINDA ADALET: 6. VE 7. SINIF ÖĞRENCİLERİNİN OKUL DENEYİMLERİNİ ALGILAYIŞLARI

Çelikkaya, Tülay
Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
Tez Yöneticisi: Yard. Doç. Dr. Cennet Engin Demir

Eylül, 2008, 65 sayfa

Bu çalışmanın amacı, ilköğretim okulu öğrencilerinin okul deneyimleri temelinde adalet algılarını incelemek ve adalet algılarına farklı bağımsız değişkenlerin etkilerini araştırmaktır.

Çalışmanın örneklemini Ankara il merkezinde bulunan, farklı mahallelerden seçilen yedi ilköğretim okulunun 526 öğrencisi oluşturmaktadır.

Veriler, öğrencilerin adalet algılarını ölçmek amacıyla araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilen bir anket kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Elde edilen veriler betimsel ve çıkarımsal istatistik yöntemler kullanılarak yorumlanmıştır. İlk olarak betimsel istatistik yöntem kullanılarak katılımcıların özellikleri çözümlenmiştir. Daha sonra algılanan adaletin boyutlarını belirlemek için faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Boyutlar belirlendikten sonra, algılanan adaletin boyutlarını karşılaştırmak için ilişkili örneklem tek yönlü varyans analizi yapılmıştır. Son olarak, cinsiyet, okul, başarı seviyesi, annenin eğitim seviyesi ve babanın eğitim seviyesi bağımsız değişkenlerine göre öğrencilerin adalet algılarındaki değişimi incelemek için çoklu varyans analizi yapılmıştır.

Faktör analizi sonucunda öğrenciler tarafından algılanan adaletin dört boyutlu olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır. Bunlar dağıtımsal, etkileşimsel, prosedürel ve denkleştirici adalet olarak isimlendirilmiştir. İlişkili örneklem tek yönlü varyans analizi sonucunda, boyutlar öğrencilerin okul deneyimlerini adil bulmalarına göre şöyle sıralanmışlardır: prosedürel, denkleştirici, etkileşimsel ve dağıtımsal adalet. Öğrenciler okul deneyimlerini en çok prosedürel ve denkleştirici adalet boyutlarında adil

bulmuşlardır. Çoklu varyans analizi sonucunda cinsiyet ve başarı düzeyinin öğrencilerin adalet algılarında fark yarattığı ortaya çıkmıştır.

Öğrencilerin okul deneyimlerini dağıtımsal adalet boyutunda en az adil algıladıklarını göz önünde bulundurarak, idarecilerin ve öğretmenlerin not, ödül ve ceza dağıtımında dikkatli olmaları gerekmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Adalet, Adalet Algısı, Değerler Eğitimi, Vatandaşlık Eğitimi, Demokratik Eğitim

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Dr. Cennet Engin Demir, for her insightful feedback and help during the whole process of this study.

I would like to express my grateful thanks to the members of the examining committee, Assist. Prof. Dr. Erdiñ Çakırođlu and Dr. Yařar Kondakçı. I believe their constructive suggestions will contribute so much to my study.

I would like to thank to my family members for their endless support and encouragements.

A special thanks to my friends, Seda Yařar, Elif Olcay Yücel, Ferhan Gedik and Desen Yalım for their support. Seda spent all summer with me, cheered me up and helped me much especially while I was trying to write complicated statements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Purpose of the study	4
1.2 Significance of the Study	5
1.3 Definition of Terms.....	6
1.4 Limitations	7
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	8
2.1 Theoretical Background.....	8
2.2 Value Education.....	9
2.3 Citizenship Education	13
2.4 Democratic Education.....	18
2.5 Justice in Schools.....	23
2.6 Summary of Review of the Literature.....	28
3. METHODOLOGY.....	30
3.1 Overall Design of the Study.....	30

3.2	Research Questions	30
3.3	Population and Sample Selection.....	31
3.4	Development of Data Collection Instrument	31
3.4.1	Pilot Testing of the Instrument.....	32
3.4.2	Reliability and Validity	33
3.5	Data Collection Procedure	34
3.6	Data Analysis	34
4.	RESULTS	35
4.1	Background characteristics of the sample.....	35
4.2	Results concerning the number and construct of dimensions of justice perceived by students	36
4.3	Results concerning the difference among perceived dimensions of justice	40
4.4	Results concerning the difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to certain background variables.....	42
4.4.1	Gender	43
4.4.2	Achievement	44
4.4.3	Mother and Father Educational Level.....	46
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	48
5.1	Discussions of the Results.....	48
5.1.1	Difference among Perceived Dimensions of Justice.....	48
5.1.2	Difference among Perceived Dimensions of Justice with Respect to Certain Background Variables	50
5.2	Conclusions and Implications	52
	REFERENCES.....	55
	APPENDICES	
A.	The names of the schools and number of students	61

B. Focus Group Questions	62
C. Turkish Version of the Survey Instrument	63

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

4.1	Distribution of Students Responding to Questionnaire by Background Variables.....	36
4.2	Factor Loading Obtained via Principle Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation.	37
4.3	Means and Standard Deviations for Four Factors.....	40
4.4	Repeated Contrasts of the Dimensions.....	41
4.5	Pairwise Comparisons of the Distributive, Interactional, Procedural, and Retributive Justice Factors	42
4.6	The Means and Standard Deviations of the Dimensions of Justice with Respect To the Gender	44
4.7	Comparison of Means of Male and Female Students on Four Dimensions	44
4.8	The Means and Standard Deviations of the Dimensions of Justice with Respect to the Achievement Levels	45
4.9	Comparison of the Means of High and Low Achievers on Four Dimensions.....	46
4.10	The Means and Standard Deviations of the Dimensions of Justice with Respect to the Mother and Father Educational Level	47

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Children begin to develop values initially in their families and then arrive in school with a range of different values drawn from their pre-school experiences. At this point, the expected role of the school is to build on the values children have already had and to develop new ones.

Society expects schools to contribute not only to the cognitive development of the young, but also to the moral and civic education of them (Halstead & Mark, 2006). However, educational systems have been criticized by educators as having a tendency toward narrow set of goals based on raising standardized test scores (Meier cited in Hytten, 2006, p.224). Michelli and Keiser (2005) also criticized the public schooling as focusing on test scores with stating “As thousand of teachers and teacher educators know, current conceptions of the purposes of public schooling focus extensively on quantitative measures of student achievement rather than the development of enlightened and engaged democratic citizens” (p. xvii). These remarkable words also stressed the role that schools may play in developing democratic citizens.

Living together as citizens requires a framework of shared values such as justice, tolerance and respect for others. Citizenship education clearly has a central role in developing an understanding of values and a commitment to them. Archard (2003) said that “Citizens are not born but created and the principle tool for creation of citizens is education” (p.89). Halstead & Mark (2006) argued that citizenship has a combining strength that enables people from different beliefs and backgrounds to live together peacefully in spite of differing opinions, priorities and tastes. Democratic communities, in which people live in harmony, require citizens who respect differences and internalize the virtue of justice. Justice as a virtue and a value is a requirement of democracy, and democratic societies are, just societies. They strive for equity and educate students to become just citizens.

The concept of justice which dates back to the ancient Greece has interested many scholars over years (Colquitt, Greenberg & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). Aristotle was among the first to analyze what constitutes justice in the distribution of resources between individuals (Ross, 1877).

From Greek philosophers until now, despite some differences, philosophical approaches continue to share a common prescriptive orientation, conceiving justice as normative forms. Although these philosophical approaches continue to flourish, present concern to justice is supplemented by the descriptive approach of social scientists. The conceptualizations focus on justice not as it should be, but as it is perceived by individuals (Colquitt, Greenberg & Zapata-Phelan, 2005). In this sense, understanding matters of justice requires an understanding of what people perceive to be fair.

The concept of justice has received much attention in the social sciences. This area of research has attempted to determine the criteria used by individuals when developing perceptions of justice (fairness) and the influence these perceptions have on various attitudes and behaviors (Whisenant & Jordan, 2008). While most organizational justice research has been drawn from management and psychology literature, there are studies which expand upon research in organizational justice by introducing the construct into social settings like school (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004, 2005; Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Tata, 1999).

The four types of justice in organizations important to this study are distributive, procedural, interactional and retributive justice. Adams's work on equity theory (1965) which emphasized the perceived fairness of outcomes that is distributive justice was the first study on fairness in psychology. Following the distributive justice, the focus of research shifted to procedural justice to completely explain and predict peoples' reactions to perceived injustice (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001). Subsequently, an additional conceptualization of interactional justice emerged (Bies & Moag, 1986, cited in Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, p.279) which was focused on the interpersonal side of organizational practices. Responsibility, deserve and merit are the central concepts which are used to define retributive justice (Kolm, 1996). Retributive justice is a matter of giving people what they deserve to receive.

That is to say, “people who work hard deserve the fruits of their labor, while those who break the rules deserve to be punished” (Maiese, 2004, ¶ 1).

Rawls (1971) said that “Justice is the first virtue of social institutions” (p. 3). As an essential institution of everyday life where exchanges and interactions of groups are to be encountered; schools play an important role in cultivation of the virtue of justice. Concerns about justice interest many scientists from different disciplines focusing on a variety of issues, such as use of wealth or access to medical care. The concern of this study is on justice in school context. It is important to understand the injustices connected to school life, because the basic influence on pupils in developing their perceptions of what constitutes a just society is their experience of school (Davies & Evans, 2002; Howard & Gill, 2000).

Students develop a sense of justice in the schools, and their perceptions of justice can affect the nature of the teacher-student relationship, and classroom and school climate. As Rawnsley’s study (1997) showed that positive classroom environments with higher levels of students’ perceptions of equity were associated with higher levels of leadership, helpful, friendly and understanding interpersonal behavior. In her study Tata (1999) demonstrated that perceptions of unfair distributions influence students’ evaluations of the instructor. Another study (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2005) suggested that instructors can use interactional justice as a possible means to reduce student resistance. In their other study, Chory-Assad and Paulsel (2004) demonstrated that students’ perceptions of procedural justice in a course predicted students’ likelihood of indirectly aggressing against and expressing hostility toward the course instructor.

All these studies confirmed noteworthy effects of students’ perceptions of justice within the school context. However, sense of justice may also have out-of-school effect as it forms an essential element of the political judgment that users (parents, pupils) form of the equity of the system and, through that, about the institutions of their country (EGREES, 2005). As results of the studies in the literature indicated and Gorard & Smith (2004) put into words “Ensuring a fair and equitable education system has political as well as social implications” (p.16).

The perception of justice appears to be a significant factor for an individual to be able to adapt to the school community as a student and democratic society as a citizen. Therefore, students who internalized the concept of justice by means of their school experiences will contribute to the school in the short term and to the society in the long term.

The European Commission carried out a study to identify key indicators that will be used to monitor the development of active citizenship and citizenship education in Europe. Weerd, Gemmeke, Rigter, and Rij (2005) documented a report for the European Commission about the study performed. The significance of the role of education system in disseminating the fundamental values was stressed in the report. With its content and culture, educational institutions were hold responsible for acquiring knowledge, attitudes, values and skills of participative citizenship. Besides educational content, the educational culture namely classroom climate, teaching methods and assessment methods were seen very important for active citizenship education.

Children are considered among the social actors and as such they have a say and influence over their environments. Perceiving children as “people” and “citizens” is particularly important in this piece of research. We should ensure that children and young people are adequately prepared to take their place in a democratic society and take the values of the society one step further. Since justice is one of the parameters of democratic regimes, our pupils as future citizens need to internalize this value.

1.1 Purpose of the Study

This study aims to investigate primary school students’ perceptions of justice based on their school experiences and to examine whether their perceptions show significant differences with respect to certain background variables.

This study aims to answer the following research questions:

- What are the dimensions of justice perceived by primary school students based on their school experiences?
- Is there any significant difference among the perceived dimensions of the justice?

- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to gender?
- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to school?
- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to achievement level?
- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to mother and father educational level?

1.2 Significance of the Study

This study aims to investigate primary school students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences. Schools are microcosm of society and as such, they should reflect societal values. As a value and virtue, and a parameter of democracy, justice is central to the education of young people.

When we think of students as the future citizens, we are more aware of the critical role that their perceptions of justice play in the creation of a democratic society. Turkey tries to develop democratic practices in the society. Therefore, it is especially crucial for Turkey to prepare appropriate school and classroom environments for Turkish students to internalize the democratic values.

Although, similar studies conducted abroad, nationwide or international, there is no direct research about the students' perceptions of justice in Turkey. Therefore, this study is unique in this sense to investigate Turkish primary school students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences. In this sense it is expected that this study might contribute to the literature with its results and with the instrument developed.

The analysis of the students' perceptions of justice might help teachers and school administrators attain an insight into students' perceptions of justice. This study may also provide empirical evidence central to pursuing notions of justice for curriculum developers and policy makers who are in the position to modify and control the educational system. Beside, results of this study may contribute to the teacher

training programs by providing empirical data on the treatments of teachers that are perceived as just or unjust by the primary school students in classroom and school context.

In this sense, this study might be a significant attempt to enable teachers, principals and policy makers to look at the matters from students' perspective, which may help them to meet students' expectations. It is hoped that this study leads up to new studies in which different variables such as more elements of family background or personality trait are examined.

1.3 Definition of Terms

The following terms are used in the study.

1. Citizenship education: The term refers to “institutionalized forms of political knowledge, values, attitudes, and group identifications acquisition necessary for a political community as well as its members who take place within formal and informal educational frameworks” (Ichilov, 1994, cited in Tse, 2001, p.306).
2. Democratic education: The term “grounds in the principle of humanity and it is devoted primarily to the cultivation of empathetic, respectful, and wide-awake cosmopolitan citizens” (Snauwaert, 2002, p.12).
3. Justice: Kolm (1996) defined justice as “the ethical judgment about the situation of social entities, with respect to the value of its situation for each of these social entities” (p.31).
4. Organizational justice: The term refers to people's perceptions of fairness in organizations (Greenberg, 1987).
5. Perceived justice: The term refers to “a sequence of events in which a procedure generates a process of interaction and decision making through which an outcome is allocated to someone” (Bies and Moag, 1986, cited in Davidow, 2003).
6. Values education: The term refers to “any explicit and/or implicit school-based activity to promote student understanding and knowledge of values and

to inculcate the skills and dispositions of students so they can enact particular values as individuals and as members of the wider community” (Brown, Bereznicki, & Zbar, 2003, p.2).

1.4 Limitations

The sample of this study is limited to the 6th and 7th grade students in the selected Primary Schools of Ankara. However, it must be born in mind that even schools are chosen from the different neighborhoods of Ankara, this city cannot be said to truly represent country as a whole. Therefore, the non-representative nature of the sample means that our ability to generalize the results is limited.

That the questionnaire was administered close to the end of the school year can be considered as a limitation since students may be bored with school and exams. While the questionnaire was being administered, 8th grade students were not attending to the school since they were studying for OKS examination. So, the data were gathered only from 6th and 7th grade primary school students. In addition to that questionnaire was administered in the classrooms. This may cause a limitation since students can not feel relaxed and be objective while answering the questions. However, this limitation is hindered since students were repeatedly told, orally and in writing, that their responses would be anonymous and confidential.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the review of related literature. In the first part, the history of justice is presented from the point of popular schools of thoughts, and the theories of justice are introduced. Then, literature on values education, democratic education, citizenship education and justice in schools are reviewed and presented.

2.1 Theoretical Background

Since the Greek philosophers, a number of influential thinkers including John Raws, Amartya Sen, Ronald Dworkin, and John Roemer, have made separate and important contributions to the way we think about justice. Justice as a concept is interested not only philosopher but also psychologist and sociologist.

Study of fairness in psychology began with Adams's (1965) work on equity theory emphasizing the perceived fairness of outcomes, that is, distributive fairness. Equity theory is based on the idea that individuals evaluate their relationships in terms of their contributions and benefits (Adams, 1965). According to equity theory, when individuals actually receive the outcome (e.g., exam grade) they think they deserve based on their contributions, the exchange is considered fair, and equity is assumed to exist.

The notion of fairness in organizations emerged from the social-psychological literature on distributive justice (Adams, 1965). As distributive justice deals with the perceived fairness of outcomes, it has the potential to have strong implications in the organizational context, of which distribution of outcomes is an integral part. For the present study, the organizational context in which students' perceptions of distributive justice will be sought is the school. In schools, issues of distributive justice arise in connection with who gets the teacher's attention, or who gets what grades...etc.

Following the equity theory and distributive justice, the study of justice made a shift to procedural justice. This means that the research moved from emphasizing purely

the results of reward allocation (distributive justice) to emphasizing the process by which these allocations were made (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1978). No longer was the perceived fairness of outcomes considered the only determinant of perceived organizational justice, but rather, the perceived fairness of the process by which the outcomes were achieved was also important. In school, teachers may consider students' attendance, behavior, assignments, and exam grades in assigning semester grades. When evaluating the fairness of how resource allocation decisions are made, students make judgments of procedural justice (Paulsel, Chory-Assad & Dunleavy, 2005). Findings showed that even in some cases, the distribution of rewards was not always as important as the process by which they were allocated (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2005; Tata, 1999).

Meanwhile, an additional conceptualization of interactional justice emerged (Bies & Moag, 1986, in Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, p.281). Interactional justice is focused on the interpersonal side of organizational practices, specifically, the interpersonal treatment and communication by management to employees. It implies the quality of treatment such as politeness, honesty, and respect. In schools, interactional justice involves student evaluations of how respectful, polite, and open student- instructor communication is.

Another construct of organizational justice is retributive justice which is a matter of giving people what they deserve (Maiese, 2004, ¶ 1). Retributive justice is a construct of organizational justice which is defined by Kolm (1996) as "the establishing, or endorsing, relations from an agent's act or action to advantages or costs for this agent" (p.232). Responsibility, deserve and merit are the central concepts which are used to define retributive justice (Kolm, 1996). In school setting, punishment, praise, and grade distribution are some of the concepts which can be examined with respect to merit and deserve.

2.2 Values Education

In this section, value education and the significant role of the schools in values development will be presented. The importance of the students' attainments of justice as a value will be observed and the relationship between value education and citizenship education will be discussed.

The term 'values' is described by Halstead & Mark (2006) as the principles and fundamental convictions which act as general guides to behavior, the standards by which particular actions are judged to be good, right, desirable or worthy of respect, the enduring beliefs about what is worthwhile, and the ideals for which people strive. Examples of values are presented as emotion, equality, freedom, justice, security, peace of mind and truth.

Schools provide students with various knowledge, and attitudes, some of which they are intended to teach and some not. But all of them improve students' understanding of the world, of what it is to be human, and the nature of good and bad, right and wrong. There is a growing recognition that schools should prepare children not only for work but also for life. Halstead and Mark (2006) argued that "Preparing someone for living rather than working is a weight responsibility, and it is, perhaps, a simpler task to consider the level of numeracy or literacy a person may require in order to perform certain forms of employment" (p.1).

Expressing the importance of value education, Frazer (2002) stated that

If values such as equality, tolerance of difference, political liberty, or free speech are truly valuable they are so because they are morally right, because they are values for human beings as such. This means that one important goal for education is the imparting of and the critical consciousness of these values (p. 39).

For as long as there has been education there has been value education, and indeed the formation of character and the development of virtue have for many centuries been seen as the scope of the educational systems (Halstead & Mark, 2006). Aristotle (cited in Ross, 1908) categorized virtue as intellectual and moral. According to Aristotle, intellectual virtue may grow with teaching; however moral virtue comes about as a result of habit and none of the moral virtues arises in us by nature. He thought that the goal of education should be identical with the goal of man. And man look for happiness. For Aristotle the happy man is the educated man. The happy and the good man, is a virtuous man, but virtue is acquired precisely through education.

There are arguments on which values schools should teach (Halstead, 2006). Different types of values may be categorized either on the basis of the ideology or philosophy of education. Here, values will be examined as private and public values.

In their book *Citizenship and Moral Education: Values in Action*, Halstead & Mark (2006) distinguished between private and public values as stating that “The private values are preferences which are not shared, but on the other hand, public values are shared and they are more fundamental than mere preferences” (p.24). Moreover Halstead and Mark (2006) appended that “The only values, the common school can promote, are the public values of the society such as justice, truth, tolerance and respect for others” (p.45). Their words answered to the question of ‘whose values are the right values to be taught in schools.’

Public values are frequently expressed in law and in terms of rights and they are a variety of democratic principles. Being strengthened with law, expressed in terms of human rights and a principle of democracy, justice well deserves to be treated as a public value and be taught in public schools.

Although the development of values begins in early childhood and goes on throughout life, school is a unique place to influence these processes by providing opportunities for discussion, reflection and increasing understanding. According to the Crick Report (1998), even at primary school age, children are already forming through learning and discussion, concepts of fairness, and attitudes to rules, to decision-making, to authority, to their local environment and social responsibility.

Bottery (2000) advised to be aware of the fact that economic and social concerns are having considerable effect on education system, and they have new demands from teachers and schools in the delivery of values education.

Halstead and Mark (2006) introduced three roles of common school in values development. Firstly, it should reflect the values of the society. Then, it should fill in gaps in students’ knowledge and understanding of values. Lastly and perhaps most importantly it should help students to choose a rational path through the variety of influences imposing on their developing values.

Values are not only central to moral education but also essential for citizenship education. Teaching citizenship requires the promotion of values. Halstead & Mark (2006) declared that the “Moral education is a vital and unavoidable aspect of citizenship because dispositions and values, as well as skills and knowledge, are to

be fostered” (p.2). Besides, Kerr (1999) discussed that a country’s approach to citizenship education may vary with respect to its preference between value-explicit or value-neutral citizenship education. Crick (1998), promoting a value-explicit citizenship education, argued that “Any teaching of citizenship not based on moral values and reasoning would either be mechanical and boring, or even dangerous” (p.19).

Edward (2004, cited in Weerd, Gemmeke, Rigter & Rij, 2005, p.15) who is another supporter of value education in schools, maintained that the achievement of a good society requires values-based energy and direction. However, this cannot be achieved only by voluntary efforts. Norms and values which are fostered in families, schools and workplaces are required to protect all social agreements.

Citizenship education clearly has an important role to play in developing an understanding of or a commitment to the values and providing students with the capacity to make judgments in the matters of morality and social justice. However, Halstead & Mark (2006) argued that morality is a broad concept which would be distorted if taught only or mainly through citizenship education. It is not an easy task for schools to teach empathy, moral imagination and moral judgment, as well as concepts like love, justice and fairness. If moral values are an essential part of being a person, they should be central to the whole of education, not confined to one small part of the curriculum.

Hullfish (1960) stated that the school is the only agency among many concerned with values. He thought that the values will not only be flourished through the direct instruction. Halstead and Mark (2006) remarked other ways of learning values such as observing teachers, observing school rituals, observing the school environment, observing the ethos of the school, and observing democracy in action in the school.

This study is primarily concerned with the development of values through the ethos of the school. Ethos of the school refers to the general atmosphere within the school (Halstead & Taylor, 2000). It is an important element both in school effectiveness and in values education. Lickona (1991, cited in Halstead & Taylor, 2000, p.175) argued that the moral climate of the school must be consistent with the values attained by instruction.

No community can exist without some shared values, and school as a community is either. Not only with its curriculum but also with its culture, school flourishes moral values. That is to say, social interaction and communication, attitudes of teachers and the discipline procedures etc. constitute the ethos of school and they have an indisputable influence on the developing values, attitudes and personal qualities of young people.

2.3 Citizenship Education

The roles and goals of schools change as the meanings and the purposes of society change. Contemporary world is looking for a society based on freedom and democracy. Since schools are the mini-societies, they are responsible for preparing students to be a part of this society. Hence, one of the central purposes of education should be helping students develop the knowledge, values, habits, and skills necessary for democratic citizenship.

In recent years, increasing concern about the preparation of young people for the opportunities, responsibilities and experiences of adult life (Department of Education and Science, 1988) has led to the development of school councils and other activities designed to maintain a practical understanding of democratic procedures and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (Bottery, 1990). One of the outcomes of this concern is the citizenship education by which active citizens with a commitment to certain public values and practices is intended to be produced (Halstead, 2006).

Countries are generally agreed on the need to include citizenship education in the formal school curriculum in one way or another. However, the way it is developed and provided varies considerably from one country to the other. Approaches to citizenship education are of three main possible kinds. It may be offered as a separate subject (often compulsory), or may be integrated into conventional subjects (such as history, social studies, geography or philosophy) or be conceived as a cross-curricular theme. In primary education, most countries tend to offer citizenship education as either integrated into other subjects or treated as a cross-curricular theme. By contrast, in secondary education (or at certain stages of it), nearly half of all European countries have established a separate subject for teaching pupils citizenship (Eurydice, 2005).

With the implementation of citizenship education and development of school councils; Turkish education system also contributes to the development of democratic citizenship. Even in the foundation years of Turkish Republic, there was a citizenship course (Malûmat-ı Vataniye) in which a course book that was prepared with the effective contributions of Atatürk was used (Gözütok, 2003). This course aiming to teach citizenship had a place in the curriculum of primary school with different names over years. However, with the implementation of new curriculum, in 2005-2006 Education Years, this course was taken out of the primary schools' course table, and its contents were integrated into Social Studies Course.

Currently, citizenship education is seen as one means of facing up to the challenges of the 21st century (Eurydice, 2005). But, it is not a new concept. Citizenship education has a long history beginning with the ancient Greece to the contemporary world. With time and place, practices of citizenship education revealed many differences, understandable by different politics. For instance, prior to the modern era, citizenship education was designed for people to participate in the life of their state (Heater, 2003). In the age of nationalism, it served to educate people for a consciousness of nationhood. And now, there is a rising interest in the consciousness of world citizenship which encompasses the principles of social and economic justice, both within and between nations; non-adversarial decision making at all levels of society; equality of the sexes; racial, ethnic, national and religious harmony; and the willingness to sacrifice for the common good (UN-NGLS, 1997).

Wilkins (2000) clarifies the evolution of citizenship, which dates back to the era of the Greek city, as a continually change both deepening (by increasing the scope of 'democratic involvement') and broadening (by ever widening the franchise beyond the male property-owning elite class). Such changes have a noticeable influence on the definition of, and approach to, citizenship education. Carrying out a comparative study in which a wide range of terms including citizenship, civics, social sciences, social studies, world studies, society, studies of society, life skills and moral education were covered, Kerr (1999) revealed this change by concluding that "There had been a shift in many countries away from a narrow, knowledge-based approach in citizenship education to one encompassing knowledge and understanding, active experiences and the development of student values, dispositions, skills, and

aptitudes” (p.27). Therefore, citizenship education is more than teaching factual knowledge of key laws, governing bodies and historical documents. It is also about developing students’ attitudes toward their government, their concept of rights and responsibilities, and the meaning of democracy in their country (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2001). In this well known Crick Report (1998), the aim and the purpose of citizenship education was said to be the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and values relevant to the nature and practices of participative democracy. It was also emphasized that citizenship education should cultivate awareness and concern for world affairs and global issues.

Hence, it is inevitable that citizenship education is responsible for enlightening students about both nationwide and worldwide issues. Transnational and global organizations mark recognition to the issues such as respect for human rights and preservation of the environment. Schools can help children to recognize the human rights discourses. And what is clear is that teaching about human rights is an important part of the citizenship curriculum, and this includes learning about responsibilities and the ethic of association among communities- local, national and inter-nation (Lockyer, 2003).

Political theorists are continually attempting to define citizenship and to categorize approaches to the rights and obligations anticipated with it. Perhaps the most famous definition is T.H. Marshall’s (1950) categorization of citizenship as the extension of civil, social and political. T.H. Marshall (1950) had argued that citizenship comprises three distinct, but related dimensions: the civil, the political and the social. “The civil is composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom,” said Marshall (1950), and went on, “By the political element I mean the right to participate in the exercise of political power.” By the social element he meant “The whole range from the right to a small amount of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society” (p.8).

The Crick report (1998) reinterpreted Marshall’s definition and describes citizenship education as comprising social and moral responsibility, community involvement

and political literacy. The social element of citizenship which includes guidance on moral values and personal treatment was said to be near the heart of the matter.

Examining the concepts of fairness, this study mainly explores the social aspect of citizenship education. For Marshall (1950) the social component of citizenship is one of the cornerstones of democracy. Ichilov (1998) agreed with Marshall and expressed the importance of social component of citizenship education. He declared that social gaps create alienated citizens and great social unrest may undermine democracy.

There is a developing research literature about school children's perspectives of the role that citizenship plays in their lives. Much of this research pays particular attention to students' understanding of their rights, as well as the importance of political education and civic engagement (Crick, 1998; Eurydice, 2005; Hine, 2004; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald & Schulz, 2001).

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Civic Education Study started in 1994 and lasted until 2001. It was designed to assess the civic knowledge of 14-year-old students across 28 countries. This large scale international study have sought to gain a clearer understanding of students' concepts of democracy and citizenship and how this varies across different nations, both those with long established and those with newly established democratic systems. The data was collected through a test of civic knowledge and attitudes via a survey using questionnaires completed by students, teachers, and schools. One of the three domains covered by the study was the meaning of democracy in national context. Additional survey questions assessed students' perceptions of the climate of the classroom as well as other background variables. One of the conclusions of this international study was that schools that model democratic practice are most effective in promoting civic knowledge and engagement (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001). This conclusion supports rationale that there is association between perceptions of the democratic practices in school and in society.

Jean Hine (2004) carried out a study in England to explore children's understanding of the citizenship and of what is fair or not fair. Children across the age range seven to 15 years from as diverse a range of backgrounds as possible were included in the study. In this piece of research children was perceived as "people" and "citizens" in

their own right is particularly important, and the focus groups design is used as a means of achieving this. The total number of groups (including the pilot) was 41, which involved 269 children, split between 151 primary age children and 118 secondary age children (this includes two older children who took part in groups). In total 117 girls and 152 boys took part.

Results of that study demonstrated that significant opportunities are being lost. Hine (2004) clarifies this statement as declaring that for children to comprehend important concepts and to apply these concepts as they grow older they need to experience them in school by having them demonstrated by adults. This inference is significant as it expresses the importance of children's school experiences in citizenship education.

Another conclusion of this research study was that children were found to have a very strong sense of fairness and be quick to spot what they see as unfair treatment. To illustrate, children described how teachers would often shout at the children but would warn the children when they raised their voices to each other or to the teacher. In addition, children expressed that they do not trust the teachers in their schools, because they often feel that teachers do not respect them. Being listened to and treated with respect is the right of a citizen, and public institutions have a responsibility to try to ensure that this happens. This finding confirms that what happens in schools, between teachers and students matters in citizenship education and specifically in value education.

At the Lisbon European Council in March 2000, strategic goals for 2010 were set for the European Community. Active citizenship was one of the central issues in the Lisbon programme. The key issue regarding active citizenship was to ensure that the learning of democratic values and democratic participation by all was promoted. The European Commission, DG Education and Culture, decided to carry out a study. The goal of this study was to identify indicators that will enable the European Commission to monitor the development of active citizenship and citizenship education in Europe.

The scope of the study was all 25 European Member States, the two candidate Member States (one of them was Turkey), two acceding countries and the three

states of the European Economic Area. Also, the study had to be performed from a lifelong learning perspective. Furthermore, the study took into account the fact that active citizenship can take place at the local, regional, national, European and global level. Five international datasets were selected to be used as survey vehicle. These are the Civic Education Study (CivEd), the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) survey, the European Social Survey (ESS), the Eurobarometer surveys and the World Values Study (WVS).

The European Commission aimed to identify key indicators that will be used to monitor the development of active citizenship and citizenship education in Europe. These indicators are classified as input (what is taught) and output (what is learnt) indicators. The relevance between different input and output indicators were seek through literature review. In so doing, elements of citizenship education that were likely to have an impact on the output of citizenship education were determined. As an input indicator, culture in education was found to be very relevant. This result is noteworthy as it supports the current study in its attempts to search justice in school culture.

Another important source of information on how citizenship is perceived in European countries is the Eurydice report on citizenship education. The report shows that when different national documents on citizenship education are studied, it becomes clear that responsible citizenship is often linked to civic values such as democracy and human rights, equality and tolerance, active participation, social responsibility, solidarity and social justice (Eurydice, 2005).

2.4 Democratic Education

The literature which examines how schools function as democratic institutions to instill perception of justice in students, and how this perception may affect their social life as citizens will be presented in this part. The justice principle of democracy will be discussed and its associations with education will be presented.

Dewey (1915) considered democracy as a concept much broader and deeper than a special political form, a method of performing government, of making laws and

administration. He defined democracy as a way of life, social and individual. As a way of life that comprise the formation of values with the participation of all.

White (1996, cited in Halstead, 2006) expressed the importance of the moral dimension of democracy by saying; “democracy is distinguished by its values — justice, freedom, and respect for personal autonomy rather than by bits of machinery, like fixed-term governments, free elections, a legal opposition and free trade unions” (p. 37).

While the Crick (1998) report incorporated the values of autonomy and respect for individual rights, associated with liberal education, the main emphasis was on preparing young people for active participation in democratic life. It was said that active participation in democratic life involves more than understanding the practices and purpose of democratic institutions at local and national level. It extends to acquiring skills and aptitudes, and the appropriate ‘values and disposition’ associated with active citizenship.

Democracy is seen by liberals as “the most rational safeguard against tyranny and the best way of guaranteeing the equal right of citizens to determine for themselves what is in their own best interests” (Halstead, 2006, p.29). Democratic societies are just societies. Hence, social justice is an integral feature of democratic life. Democratic citizens strive for equity and try to educate students to become just citizens, who are, as Walter Parker (Parker, 2003, cited in Hytten, 2006) noted, “principled and compassionate, who refrain from harming or exploiting others, and who believe it is their duty both to protect just institutions and to prevent injustice” (p.221).

At this point we have to consider the significant role of schooling in the cultivation of democratic values. Lockyer (2003), warns us to recognize the critical role which education plays in equipping young people for democratic life. School is a crucial locus for training children to become democratic citizens. Archard (2003) commended the well known Crick report (1998) for recognizing that a healthy democracy needs good citizens and that these are not born, but created by an appropriate education.

Agreed with Crick, Parker (2002) stated that the principles of democracy are not carried by genes. Explicitly, democratic relations are not given; they are created. Democratic citizens are not born already grasping principles of democracy such as justice, or tolerance. They are social, moral, and intellectual attainments, and they are not easily won.

Therefore, for students to attain these hard won skills, education system is expected to shape curriculum and instruction toward the formation of democratic citizens. Actually, this is not a current concern for educators; it has been the case for a very long time.

Lockyer (2003) thought that although schools are limited arenas for democratic practices, it should be considered that to what degree they might promote democratic involvement. Schools are the institutions where students do have a little saying in the administration. However, as Halstead (2006) uttered, if schools are demanded to contribute to a just democracy in society, “children need to learn the value of democracy not just in their head, but in their heart; this probably means that schools need to be run more like democracies” (p. 145). Certainly, this does not mean that students will have the right to comment on policies or administration. But, we should imagine more fully the democratic possibilities of education, especially when democracy is conceived as a way of life in which students know their rights and responsibilities, question the things happening around them, stay open to new ways of thinking about what is good and just and most importantly feel free to express their beliefs and ideas.

Civic education is a vital means by which society transmits to the next generation the core knowledge, skills, and dispositions of democratic citizenship. Weerd, Gemmeke, Rigter & Rij (2005) pointed out that if schools will act effectively in the functioning of democracy, all sets of voices should be heard and inequality and discrimination should be seen as the enemies of the public sphere.

As mentioned in Eurydice, most countries (e.g. Czech Republic, Germany, Lithuanian, and Iceland) explicitly acknowledge the importance of a positive school culture, and refer to its impact on the relations of all school partners concerned. They support the idea of a ‘democratic school’ in which democratic values and teaching

methods prevail and in which all those concerned, especially teachers, parents and pupils, are involved in school management and decision-making. One important feature of the 'democratic school' is the promotion of active and responsible pupil participation in daily school life (Eurydice, 2005).

Black (2000) in his thesis study presented the social justice arguments for linking education with the future achievement of democracy. Namely, he stated that "if the school curriculum is not designed to enable students to be critical consumers of information, government policy, and global events, then students are not guaranteed the receipt of an education that enables them to be active participants in their own democratic governance" (p. 17). The fact is that as long as social inequality endures and it is supported by the dominant structures and systems within a nation (i.e. school curricula, mainstream media sources, and government policy), democracy does not exist.

Black (2000) meant that we need to help students think more critically about the world around them, about media, language, representations, social relationships, popular pleasures, and power dynamics. In short, we must help them to become more active citizens in a globalized world. This study is such a platform for students to think more critically about their experiences and to express their ideas freely about whether they perceive justice in school or not.

In the project named 'Human Rights in Course Books', 190 course books evaluated within human rights concept in Turkey. In the end of the project, evaluations and recommendation were revealed in a book. The book consists of findings and suggestions about the education of democracy as well. Namely, in course books, it was recognized that democracy is solely defined as the knowledge and attitude about government. In that case, democracy is set apart from its contemporary meaning which includes the production of various ideas and the debate over them and it was only presented with one dimension that is election politics. Because of, it was recommended that current understanding and philosophy of education should be questioned. The consciousness of democracy which is absent in the course books is based on the production of different views, respect for diversity, dialog and tolerance. Therefore, it was suggested that curriculum should be reviewed carefully

and course books should be prepared in such a way to convey the consciousness of democracy and human rights (Çayır, 2003).

In her dissertation study, Melina Patterson (2002) investigated the relationship between schools and the communities in which they are located. This study looked at place-based efforts to use schools to pursue social justice in a diverse society in order to better understand how people try to change schools to effect larger social changes. Patterson used debates over democracy, diversity, and community to frame school based efforts to pursue social change. Agreed with the idea of schooling for social change, progressive education was examined in this study. Patterson (2002) emphasized that one of the aspects of progressive education was to create a better society. Relating this aspect to the goals of community schools, Patterson (2002) highlighted a weakness in many schools. That is; “frequently the schools do not explicitly debate what ‘social justice’ means for the citizens “(p.9).

In his thesis study, Uslu (2003) aimed to determine the level of democratic attitudes in the upper-primary school teachers and students. He asserted that, as music is thought by music, and painting is thought by painting, democracy should be thought with democracy that is equipped with its values. Results of this study demonstrated that female teachers and students have a stronger wish for the democratic school culture than the male teachers and students. And this result is supported with the data that students whose mothers are working wish democratic atmosphere more than the others.

In her thesis study, Kaldırım (2003) aimed to determine how the primary school eight graders perceive democracy which takes place in the curriculum of Social Studies education and what are effective o their present perceptions about this concepts.. A questionnaire was prepared and conducted in 12 primary schools of Ankara to 464 students. Equity was taken as a dimension of democracy. Regarding this dimension, a significant difference was found between male and female students. The researchers interpreted this finding as female students comprehend equity dimension of democracy better than male students. Moreover, results demonstrated that most of the students (% 92) comprehended the relationship between democracy and political, socials rights. Students (% 87) were aware of the significance of the

equity between female and male for democracy. Students' perceptions of the equity dimension of democracy showed significant difference according to mother and father education. Kaldırım (2003) interpreted this finding as while the parents' level of education gets higher, equity dimension of democracy is better comprehended. Students' perceptions of equity dimension of democracy did not show significant difference according to the socio-economic level of schools. Finally, it was concluded that schools were found to be unsuccessful in the students' attainments of democratic behaviors. As a suggestion, Kaldırım (2003) stated that to cause students to gain democratic abilities, schools should create a democratic atmosphere. Only then, an effective democracy education could be achieved.

A democracy must necessarily be built upon the principle of justice: that is to say: social justice. Justice is applied in society through social services, respect and social status, as well as the fair distribution of valued resources, such as employment income, housing and the decision-making (i. e. the government). These abilities are enabled through every citizen's receipt of a quality education wherein we are taught to understand, critique, and evaluate our social world.

One of the central purposes of education should be to help students develop the knowledge, habits, skills, and dispositions necessary for democratic citizenship. These include learning to think critically, to participate in public dialogue, to consider the rights and needs of others, to live in harmony with diverse groups of people, to act on important social issues, to be accountable for one's choices and decisions.

2.5 Justice in Schools

The process of exchange is almost continual in human interactions (Adams, 1965). It takes place, explicitly or implicitly, between teammates, teacher and student, child and parent, patient and therapist, and for between all there are expectations of a fair exchange. The school is certainly one of the fundamental institutions of society where exchanges and relations are within the experience of almost everyone and constitute a significant aspect of human interaction. For children, school is likely to be the most important arena of their experience of socialization.

Although, justice has been widely studied by political scientists and researchers of organizational behavior, it has been examined within the instructional context as well (Chory-Assad, 2002; Tyler, 1987; Tata, 1999). The current study aims to develop this area of research through its examination of students' perceptions of justice in their school experiences.

When the related literature is reviewed, there are wide range of studies examining equity of quality of education or the quantity of it, external inequalities (in wealth, social capital or cultural capital) effecting education system, and the internal inequalities within the system. This study is interested in the internal injustices within the system. When the studies of this type are reviewed, it is seen that there are studies on both the antecedents of perceived justice/injustice and the consequences of it (such as aggression, resistance). This study precisely examines the antecedents of perceived injustice. The main focus of this study is students' perceptions of equity in their school experiences. These experiences include the student-teacher interactions, the grades, rewards, praises, punishment, and gender-disparity.

Equity of the European Educational Systems a Set of Indicators (2005) was a project which was a result of collaboration between six European university teams, and was carried out as part of the Socrates 6.1.2. programme, with the support of the European Commission. The project was intended to measure and compare the equity of the education systems in the European Union Member States. A report published at the end of a two-year period work on the issue of the equity of educational systems. This publication includes twenty-nine devised indicators of equity of educational systems and analytical interpretation of them.

In this project, some of the data gathered from different databases such as PISA or studies such as IEA Civic Education Study. But the rest of the data gathered by a survey namely European pilot survey about feelings of justice at school. This survey was prepared to measure the injustice that affects daily experience for pupils, by questioning a sample of 13-14 year old pupils, as well as their teachers in five European countries: Belgium (French Community), Spain (Madrid), France (Paris), Italy (Rome), and the United Kingdom (Wales), between November and December 2002.

One of the indicators of equity of educational systems was the students' criteria of justice. This indicator revealed pupils' opinions about what a fair schooling system would be like and outlined the criteria for equity and justice based on the students' estimation of how they should be treated by their teachers in school, as well as what constitutes acceptable academic outcomes at the end of compulsory schooling. The data source of this indicator was the Questionnaire for pupil of European pilot survey about feelings of justice at school. The results suggested that a clear majority of students felt that teachers should give equal attention to all pupils, and this was felt slightly more strongly by female pupils, and particularly strongly by the British students. In addition, in the other countries there was considerable support for the idea that more attention should be given to the least able pupils, and this was particularly marked among pupils who reported achieving low marks. There was almost no support among pupils from any of the countries for the notion that able students should receive the most attention in class.

Another indicator, students' feeling of being treated with justice, tried to identify the way students perceive the treatment they receive at school. Generally, students feel that they are treated with justice and they consider that the marks they receive to be fair. However, when they judge a teacher's behavior in relation to a group of students, their opinions become more negative: they consider that teachers do not treat pupils in an equal way, and punishments and rewards - as an expression of this treatment - differ according to the yield and the behavior of pupils. In the five countries participating in the survey, the percentage of students who agree with the sentence "Teachers treat me with justice" varies between 70.1 % for France and 78.2 % for Spain, which can be considered a high score. However, when they are asked for their opinions about the sentence "The teachers respect all pupils" the level of agreement decreases in a remarkable way, especially for the United Kingdom and France, where just 49 % and 55.9 % of pupils, respectively, maintain this assertion (EGREES, 2005).

A changing opinion was seen among countries in relation to punishments and rewards. However, there was a common line in the sense that it is likely that punishments are related to failures and a strong inclination that the punishment of some pupils is more likely than others because of the same failure. This opinion is

much more supported by pupils that have low marks at school and by pupils of highest status. Opinion about rewards is quite positive: pupils perceive a fair relation between rewards and merits. The judgment about the adequacy of rewards in relation to the feeling of being treated with justice is more habitual at school than about adequacy of punishments. Moreover, pupils think that marks received are suitable for the effort made and are fair. These opinions are maintained by a high percentage of pupils and differences that could occur between several variables, countries, status and academic results are scarce, which supports the belief that marks are a reward for effort and, except for pupils with low marks, these marks are considered fair.

The indicator, students' judgments on the equity of the educational system, gives a measure of the students' estimation of how equitable they perceive their educational system to be. The clear majority of respondents felt that everyone received the same quality of education, and this was true for all countries and groups. There is some limited support, especially in France and Spain, for the idea that schools actually provide a better education for the most able. There is almost no support for the idea that schools are providing a better education for the least able. Therefore, by comparing this with the first indicator mentioned here, students' criteria of justice, in which pupils showed significant support for more attention for the least able, all systems are seen to be failing to meet one specific demand for equity.

To date, most justice research has focused on student perceptions of fairness as predictors of student antisocial or potentially destructive responses. Chory-Assad and Paulsel (2004, 2005) are well known researchers of such studies. In their study (2004), *Classroom Justice: Student Aggression and Resistance as Reactions to Perceived Unfairness*, they examined the relations between students' perceptions of distributive and procedural justice in college classes and student aggression and hostility toward their instructors and resistance of their instructors' requests. The study demonstrated that student perceptions of procedural justice in a course predicted students' likelihood of indirectly aggressing against and expressing hostility toward the course instructor. Furthermore, students' perceptions of procedural justice predicted their likelihood to resist their instructors' requests through the use of deception and revenge strategies. Procedural and distributive justice did not interact to predict likelihood of students to aggress toward, be hostile

toward, or resist instructors. Finally, males were more likely than females to indirectly aggress against their instructors and to resist their instructors by disrupting the class. Lastly, expanding the distributive justice measure did not result in distributive justice predicting student aggression or hostility. This finding means that distributive justice may not play as important a role as procedural justice in the instructional setting.

Another study of Chory-Assad & Paulsel (2005) was aimed to examine students' perceptions of instructor interactional justice as a predictor of students' self-reported likelihood of using teacher-owned resistance strategies. Researchers intended to provide further insight into the dynamics of the teacher-student relationship and lead to knowledge that can be applied to the prevention and control of destructive student resistance. Results of this study indicated that students' perceptions of instructor's interactional justice negatively predicted the student resistance strategies of Teacher Advice, Teacher Blame, Appeal to Powerful Others, and Modeling Teacher Affect. This study suggests that instructors use interactional justice as a possible means to reduce student resistance.

Results suggested that students who perceived less interactional justice were more likely to resist by giving the instructor advice to remedy the problem, blaming the instructor, complaining to others with more authority than the instructor, and modeling the instructor's lack of concern with the educational experience the present research suggests that if instructors want to effectively manage their classrooms, they should be fair in their interactions with students.

Rawnsley (1997) in his dissertation study discovered that positive classroom environments with higher levels of students' perceptions of equity were associated with higher levels of leadership, helpful friendly and understanding interpersonal behavior and also behavior which give students some responsibility and freedom. Positive learning environments (e.g. high amounts of equity) were negatively associated with uncertain, dissatisfied, admonishing and strict behavior.

The other study whose results are significant for the present one was conducted by Tata (1999). The purpose of this scenario-based experimental study was to examine the influence of the fairness of grade distributions and grading procedures on

students' evaluation of the instructor. Distributive fairness was manipulated by providing participants with grades that either met expectations or were lower than expected. Procedural fairness was manipulated by providing consistent or inconsistent grading procedures.

The results of this study indicated that students' evaluations of an instructor are influenced by distributive fairness because participants who received expected grades gave higher evaluations than those receiving grades lower than expected. Procedural fairness also influenced evaluations of the instructor. Participants provided higher evaluations under consistent procedures than under inconsistent procedures. The fairness of grading procedures, however, influenced evaluations of the instructor only under unfair grade distributions. When students received expected (fair) grade distributions, grading procedures did not significantly influence evaluations of the instructor. This suggests that procedural fairness becomes more salient under conditions of distributive unfairness.

2.6 Summary of Review of the Literature

In this study, justice was considered as a value and the literature related to the values education was reviewed. Then, justice was considered as a virtue of citizens and the literature related to the citizenship education was reviewed. Next, justice was considered as a principal of democracy and the literature related to the democratic education was reviewed. Finally, the literature related to the justice in school context was reviewed.

Review of the literature indicated that justice was one of the public values that the schools should promote. It was argued that values can not only be developed through the direct instruction, but the general atmosphere of the school should also reflect values that were aimed to flourish. Therefore, it may be concluded that students' school experiences are central to their values education.

The review of the literature also revealed that the values are not only central to moral education but also essential for citizenship education. Teaching citizenship requires the promotion of values and the awareness of rights and duties. The review of the national and international studies provided information about the citizenship

education. One of the conclusions of international Civic Educational Study (Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001) was that schools that model democratic practice are most effective in promoting civic knowledge and engagement. This result confirmed that there is association between perceptions of the democratic practices in school and in society. Therefore, students should be considered as future citizens and should be educated and treated correspondingly.

Literature also provided information about within-school and out-of-school effects of students' perceptions of justice. Students' perceptions of justice may affect the nature of the teacher /student relationship, and the classroom and school climate. Besides, sense of justice may form a reaction to the institutions and in general may cause criticism towards the equity of the system. Hence, the literature revealed the crucial ends of students' perceptions of justice.

Therefore, the literature review suggested that in order to arrange schools in a way to reflect public values and develop democratic citizens, it is essential to consider students' perceptions of justice.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the overall design of the study, research questions, population and sample selection, development of data collection instrument, data collection and data analysis procedures.

3.1 Overall Design of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate primary school students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences.

The sample of this study consisted of students from seven primary schools from different neighborhoods of Ankara. Neighborhoods were designated with respect to the socio-economic status of the residents.

The survey technique was used in this study. It is a cross-sectional survey since information was gathered from a sample that has been drawn from a pre-determined population at just one point in time. Students were presented with a self-administered questionnaire in which they were asked to answer questions related to their perceptions of justice based on their school experiences. Items used in the questionnaire were selected from the related literature and tested for reliability through a pilot study. The questionnaire was administered in the classes. Descriptive and inferential statistics were employed to provide deeper insight into the research questions.

3.2 Research Questions

The research questions of the study are:

- What are the dimensions of justice perceived by primary school students based on their school experiences?
- Is there any significant difference among the perceived dimensions of the questionnaire?

- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to gender?
- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to achievement level?
- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to mother educational level?
- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to father educational level?
- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to the interaction between mother and father educational level?

3.3 Population and Sample Selection

The participants of this study included 526 students from 7 public primary schools. First, neighborhoods were selected with respect to the socio-economic status (SES) of their residents. Then, primary schools were chosen from the lists of primary schools in each of the neighborhoods. The names of the schools and the number of students who responded to the questionnaire from each school are presented in the Appendix A.

3.4 Development of Data Collection Instrument

This study employed a questionnaire to collect data on the students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences. Students' Perceptions of Justice Questionnaire is a 25-item measure that was developed by the researcher.

For the purpose of determining the items of the questionnaire, the literature related to the perception of justice, equity, and democracy was reviewed (Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004; Smith & Gorard, 2006; Fisher, Waldrip & Brok, 2005). In addition, focus group method was used to examine students' understanding of the justice concept and evaluate the clarity of some of the items determined as a result of literature review.

Focus group was conducted in one primary school in Ankara. The composition of focus group was based on the homogeneity and similarity of the group members to the target population. Six students were selected according to their communicative skills with the help of school administrator and they were asked open-ended questions to find out whether students have a general idea about the terms and concepts of the research topic (See Appendix B). Students were informed about the purpose of the interview, the rules of the discussion, and reassured about the voluntary and confidential nature of their participation. The procedure of capturing data from focus group was manual note-taking.

Based on the literature review, and the focus group interview, a questionnaire with two sections were prepared (Appendix C). The first section requested background information. Selected background variables were those that might affect directly or indirectly the students' responses. The requested information of this section was about the name of the school, grade level of the student, sex, previous semester grade point average (gpa), number of sisters and brothers, mother's and father's educational level, number of books at home. The second section of the questionnaire included 25 items related to the interpretation of students' school experiences in the light of justice. Items were scored according to a 5-point Likert-scale format with 1 being "never", 2 being "rarely", 3 being "sometimes", 4 being "often", and 5 being "always". Thus it was assumed that while 1 being "never" indicated an unjust school environment, 5 being "always" indicated a just school environment.

3.4.1 Pilot Testing of the Instrument

Pilot testing was conducted with 164 students from a primary school which was located in Ankara. They were asked to fill out the questionnaire and make comments about the statements for clarity. Questionnaire consisted of a section with 8 background questions and another section with 29 items related to the perceived justice. With respect to the results of the pilot testing some of the items were eliminated and some statements which were criticized as being ambiguous were rewritten.

Prior to assessing the reliability of items measuring students' perceptions of justice, scores for negatively stated items were reversed. A .87 alpha score as the overall

reliability coefficients of the questionnaire with 29 items was calculated for the data obtained from 164 students, indicating that the scale had high internal consistency.

Principal component analysis with a varimax rotation was run to detect structure in the relationships between variables. For a preliminary analysis of the questionnaire, correlation matrix was used to check the pattern of relationships. One-tailed significance of the coefficients was scanned to find any variable for which the majority of values are greater than .05. Correlation coefficients of four items were particularly large; therefore, there was a need to consider eliminating these items

When the rotated solution was evaluated for 29 items, it was observed that there were 9 dimensions with eigenvalues above 1. The eigenvalue of the first dimension was 7.678, while the others were 2.124, 1.792, 1.568, 1.382, 1.305, 1.135, 1.055, and 1.002 respectively. These nine dimensions explained 65.6% of variance. The ranges of factor loading for each dimension were .804-.357 for the first; .719- .456; .749-.419; .674- .477; .797- .585; .803-.450; .741- .519; .866; .837 for the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th respectively.

Considering the results of correlation coefficient, factor loading, and the examination of items clustered within each dimension in terms of their content, four items were eliminated from the questionnaire. When the content of these four items were taken into consideration, it was seen that they were investigating students' perceptions of justice about gender discrimination. It was assumed that female and male participants could not be objective while responding these items.

3.4.2 Reliability and Validity

The results of the principal component analysis were used as the evidence for construct and content validity of the questionnaire.

When the data obtained from 526 students, the reliability of the dimensions was measured to check whether the items that make up the factors are internally consistent. Coefficient Alpha calculated to measure internal consistency on four dimensions of final version of the questionnaire were 0.82, 0.60, 0.74, 0.73. Based on Cronbach's Alpha, it can be inferred that the instrument has high reliability; thus, this instrument can serve as a consistent tool in studying students' perceptions of justice.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The data needed for the study were gathered through the administration of the questionnaire in the 18 classes of 7 primary schools in first two weeks of May in 2007-2008 school year. Data were collected from the students during school hour. Each class was visited by the researcher. Students were informed about the study and asked not to write their names on the questionnaires with an aim of providing anonymity. Then, the questionnaires were administered to the students. A total of 526 questionnaires were obtained to be analyzed.

3.6 Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Principal Component Analysis, One-Way Repeated Measures of Analysis of Variance and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) were used to analyze this data.

Factor analysis was used as a data reduction and classification method. Principal component analysis with a varimax rotation was carried out for identifying clusters of variables.

One-Way Repeated Measures of Analysis of Variance was conducted to compare the dimensions of justice. Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was employed to investigate the differences in the students' perceptions of justice with respect to background variables of gender, achievement level, mother educational level and father educational level.

All the analyses were carried out by the SPSS for Windows 11.5 package program. The .05 level was established as a criterion of statistical significance for all the statistical procedures performed.

The findings of the study are presented in the chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study aims to investigate primary school students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences and to find out whether their perceptions show significant differences according to gender, achievement and mother and father education.

This chapter includes the results obtained from descriptive statistics, principal component analysis, repeated measure analysis, and MANOVA. First, the results of descriptive statistics which was employed to present the background characteristics of the participants were given. Second, the results of principal component analysis which was carried out to identify dimensions of the questionnaire were presented. Third, the results of repeated measures analysis which was carried out to compare the means of the dimensions were given. Lastly, the results of MANOVA which was performed to investigate the mean differences in the perceptions of students with respect to certain background variables were presented.

4.1 Results Concerning the Background Characteristics of the Sample

Descriptive statistics were employed to describe the background characteristics of the participants, and results were presented in Table 4.1.

The percentage of female participants (49 %) was nearly the same to the percentage of the male participants (51 %). While the % 51.9 of the subjects were 6th grade students, 48.1 % of them were 7th graders.

Achievement which is a categorical variable was grouped as "low achievers" (last semester grade point average of 2.00 to 3.49), and "high achievers" (last semester grade point average of 3.50 to 5.00). The percentage of low achievers was 30.4 % while the percentage of high achievers was 69.6 %.

The other two independent variables of the study were mother education level and father education level. Mother education level and father education level were categorical variables which were grouped as "Middle School and below" (illiterate,

literate but not completed a school, elementary school, middle school), “Secondary education” and “University education and higher” (university, master, doctoral study). The percentage of the participants whose mothers’ education was middle school and below category was 47.9 %, secondary education category was 22.2 % and university and higher category was 29.8 %. The percentage of participants whose fathers have middle school and below was 36.3 %, secondary education category was 26.5 and have university education and higher was 37.2 %.

Table 4.1

Distribution of Students Responding to Questionnaire by Background Variables

	Background Variable	N	%
Grade Level	6.00	273	51.9
	7.00	253	48.1
Gender	Female	258	49.0
	Male	268	51.0
Achievement	Low Achievers	209	39.7
	High Achievers	317	60.3
Mother Education	Middle School and below	252	47.9
	Secondary Education	117	22.2
	University education and higher	157	29.8
Father Education	Middle School and below	190	36.3
	Secondary Education	139	26.5
	University education and higher	195	37.2

4.2 Results Concerning the Perceived Dimensions of Justice

Principal component analysis with a varimax rotation was performed on 25 items to detect structure in the relationships between variables. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was computed as preliminary analysis. The value of KMO should be greater than .05 for a satisfactory factor analysis to proceed (Field, 2005). For these data, KMO value was 0.94 which indicated that factor analysis was appropriate. Additionally, Bartlett’s test of specificity was computed to determine whether correlation exists between

measurable variable. Bartlett's measure test was highly significant ($p < .001$) for these data which indicated that there are some relationships between the variables, and therefore factor analysis was appropriate.

When the rotated solution was evaluated for 25 items, it was observed that four dimensions were extracted with eigenvalues above 1. The eigenvalue of the first dimension was 8.429, while the second, third and fourth were 1.712, 1.133 and 1.048 respectively. These four dimensions explained 49.28% of variance. The first dimension explained 15.14 % of variance, the second dimension explained 11.84 % of variance, the third dimension explained 11.81 % of variance, and the fourth dimension explained 10.48 % of variance. The ranges of factor loading for each dimension were .781- .468 for the first; .628- .423, .735- .363 and .726- .382 for the 2nd, 3rd, 4th dimensions, respectively. (Table 4.2)

Table 4.2

Factor Loading Obtained via Principle Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation.

Dimensions	Items	D1	D2	D3	D4
Distributive Justice	16. Teachers treat more politely to the students with high grades.	.781	.002	.019	.086
	14. Teachers show more concern to the students with high grades.	.736	.213	.126	.053
	2. Some students are praised more than others.	.660	.065	.265	.096
	25. Teachers give permission for talk to some students much more than others.	.592	.123	.150	.179
	6. The students who get praised and rewarded are always the same students	.561	.215	.226	.205
	19. Some students are punished more severely than others though they have the same fault.	.541	.183	.171	.231
	24. Each student is praised and rewarded fairly.	.468	.411	.252	.247

Table 4.2 (Continued)

Interactional Justice	20. A student who is praised or rewarded has deserved this concern.	.170	.628	.232	.275
	23. Teachers show more concern for the students with low grades.	-.278	-.616	-.117	.257
	15. A student gets praised and rewarded since s/he has deserved it.	-.134	.565	.183	.321
	9. Teachers show equal concern for all students.	.419	.535	.377	.097
	11. Teachers act politely to all students.	.322	.447	.267	.345
	7. Teachers try to communicate well with all students.	.207	.423	.363	.302
Procedural Justice	8. Grading of exams is unfair.	.127	.143	.735	.042
	12. Each student gets the grade s/he deserves.	.070	.403	.626	.197
	5. The grading of the project and performance homework is unfair.	.252	.212	.604	.137
	1. Grading of exams is fair	.254	.118	.500	.257
	21. Always the same students are punished.	.338	-.062	.457	.264
	10. Teachers act fairly while giving permission for talk.	.293	.336	.363	.230
Retributive Justice	4. The student who is punished certainly has a fault and deserved the punishment	.137	-.039	.190	.726
	22. A student who gets a low grade has deserved it.	.165	.197	.167	.569
	18. On condition that they don't act improperly, all students are respected.	.231	.498	-.119	.508
	13. Each student is punished without discrimination if s/he has a fault.	.224	.195	.199	.506
	17. Student who gets a high grade deserves it.	.069	.329	.428	.437
	3. Male and female students are treated fairly.	.266	.310	.254	.382

Next, items clustered within each dimension were examined in terms of their content. The investigation of item content revealed that the items loaded meaningfully into dimensions. Therefore the results of the principle component analysis revealed four meaningful dimensions in this scale. These dimensions were named as (1) distributive justice, (2) interactional justice, (3) procedural justice and (4) retributive justice.

The items which were grouped under the distributive justice dimension were related to the perceived fairness of outcomes such as “showing more concern to the students with high grades”, “praising some students more than others”, “punishing some students more severely than others though they have the same fault”, and “treating more politely to the students with high grades.” Hence, this dimension was associated with the distributive justice which is a construct of organizational justice that deals with the distribution of outcomes (Adams, 1965).

The items which were grouped under the interactional justice factor were related to the perceived fairness of communication between teachers and students such as “teachers show equal concern for all the students”, “teachers try to communicate well with all students”. Interactional justice concerns the human side of organizational practices, that is, the quality of treatment such as politeness, honesty, and respect (Bies & Moag, 1986, in Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, p.279).

The items which were grouped under the procedural justice dimension were related to the evaluation of the fairness of how resource allocation decisions are made in schools such as “grading of exams is unfair”, “grading of exams is fair”, and “the grading of the project and performance homework is unfair.” As discussed in the theoretical background section, procedural justice is defined as the process by which the allocations were made (Leventhal, 1980; Thibaut & Walker, 1978).

The items which were grouped under the retributive justice factor were related to the treatment given or cause to return according to merits or deserts such as “the student who is punished certainly has a fault and deserved this punishment”, “a student who gets a low grade has deserved this grade”, and “each student is punished without discrimination if s/he has a fault.” Merit or desert is the central concepts of retributive justice (Kolm, 1996).

4.3 Results Concerning the Difference among Perceived Dimensions of Justice

As mentioned in the previous section, the principal component analysis extracted four dimensions of perceived justice: distributive justice (DJ), interactional justice (IJ), procedural justice (PJ), and retributive justice (RJ). A one-way repeated measure analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to determine if significant mean differences exist among these dimensions. The dimensions of justice that are perceived by students as most fair and least fair were examined.

To begin with the sphericity assumption of repeated measures ANOVA, Mauchly's test was checked. Sphericity assumption refers to the equality of variances of the differences between dimensions (Field, 2005). Mauchly's test indicated that the assumption of sphericity had been violated ($\chi^2(5) = 116.67, p < .001$), therefore degrees of freedom were corrected using Greenhouse-Geisser estimates of sphericity ($\epsilon = .86$). The closer that ϵ is to 1.00, the more homogeneous the variances of differences, and hence the closer the data to being spherical (Field, 2005). Therefore, it can be concluded that the data did not represent a deviation from sphericity.

The means and standard deviations for each factor are presented in Table 4.3

Table 4.3

Means and Standard Deviations for Four Factors

Dimensions	Mean	SD
Distributive Justice	2.90	1.01
Interactional Justice	3.78	.70
Retributive Justice	4.06	.81
Procedural Justice	4.10	.79

The follow-up multivariate tests indicated a significant difference among the means of 4 dimensions of perceived justice ($\lambda=.28, F(3, 523) = 452.71, p < .001, \eta^2 = .72$).

Then, repeated contrast test was used to determine priorities and to answer the research question of which dimension of perceived justice is given the greatest

importance among students (Table 4.4). According to the results, there was a significant mean difference between distributive justice dimension and interactional justice dimension [$F(1, 402.03) = 509.98, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .50$]. Likewise, there was a significant mean difference between interactional justice dimension and retributive justice dimension [$F(1, 53.67) = 136.93, p < .001, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .21$]. However, there is a non-significant difference between retributive justice dimension and procedural justice dimension [$F(1, .63) = 1.33, p = .25, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .00$].

Table 4.4

Repeated Contrasts of the Dimensions

Justice Dimensions	df	F	P	η^2
DJ vs. IJ	1	530.98	.00	.50
IJ vs. PJ	1	136.93	.00	.20
PJ vs. RJ	1	1.33	.25	.00

Repeated measures ANOVA revealed a significant overall difference among the means of 4 dimensions. A follow-up pairwise comparison was conducted to examine carefully the mean differences among dimensions. As it can be seen from the Table 4.5, the only non-significant mean difference existed between procedural justice and retributive justice ($M_{PJ}=4.10, M_{RJ}= 4.06, p=1.00$). The mean differences between DJ - IJ, DJ - PJ, DJ - RJ, and IJ - PJ, IJ - RJ were significant at the $p < .001$.

Table 4.5

Pairwise Comparisons of the Distributive, Interactional, Procedural, and Retributive Justice Factors.

(I) Justice	(J) Justice	Mean Difference (I-J)	SD	P
Distributive Justice	Interactional Justice	-.87	.038	.00
	Procedural Justice	-1.19	.035	.00
	Retributive Justice	-1.16	.037	.00
Interactional Justice	Distributive Justice	.87	.038	.00
	Procedural Justice	-.32	.027	.00
	Retributive Justice	-.28	.027	.00
Procedural Justice	Distributive Justice	1.19	.035	.00
	Interactional Justice	.32	.027	.00
	Retributive Justice	.03	.030	1.00
Retributive Justice	Distributive Justice	1.16	.037	.00
	Interactional Justice	.28	.027	.00
	Procedural Justice	-.03	.030	1.00

The mean difference is significant at the .05 level. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

4.4 Results Concerning the Difference among Perceived Dimensions of Justice with Respect to Certain Background Variables

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to answer following research questions:

- Is there any significant difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to gender?
- Is there any significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to achievement level of students?

- Is there any significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to mother educational level?
- Is there any significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to father educational level?
- Is there any significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to the interaction between mother and father educational levels?

For each MANOVA, the values of Box's test and the results of Levene's tests were checked. It was seen that the value of Box's test for each MANOVA was not significant ($p > .05$); hence the assumption of homogeneity was met. Furthermore, Levene's test results of all dependent variables in each MANOVA were non-significant ($p > .05$) which means the assumption of homogeneity of variance has been met for all analyses.

4.4.1 Gender

A one-way MANOVA was performed to find out whether there is any significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to gender. This analysis revealed that gender difference had a significant effect on the perception of justice [Wilks' $\lambda = .94$, $F(4, 521) = 7.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$]. Table 4.6 contains the means and standard deviations of the dimensions of justice with respect to the gender.

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) on each dependent variable were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA. The univariate tests revealed significant differences between male and female students on all dimensions of justice: distributive justice [$F(1, 524) = 4.66$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$], interactional justice [$F(1, 524) = 10.84$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .02$], procedural justice [$F(1, 524) = 4.50$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$], and retributive justice [$F(1, 524) = 27.29$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$].

Consistent with the results of univariate tests, comparison between means of female and male students revealed that mean differences were significant for all justice dimensions (Table 4.7)

Table 4.6

The Means and Standard Deviations of the Dimensions of Justice with Respect To the Gender

Dimensions	Gender	Mean	SD
Distributive Justice	Female	3.00	1.01
	Male	2.81	1.00
Interactional Justice	Female	3.88	.66
	Male	3.68	.71
Procedural Justice	Female	4.17	.77
	Male	4.02	.80
Retributive Justice	Female	4.24	.72
	Male	3.88	.85

Table 4.7

Comparison of Means of Male and Female Students on Four Dimensions.

Dimension	(I) Gender	(J) Gender	Mean Difference (I-J)	P
Distributive Justice	female	Male	.19(*)	.03
	Male	Female	-.19(*)	.03
Interactional Justice	female	Male	.20(*)	.00
	Male	Female	-.20(*)	.00
Procedural Justice	female	Male	.14(*)	.03
	Male	Female	-.14(*)	.03
Retributive Justice	female	Male	.36(*)	.00
	Male	Female	-.36(*)	.00

Based on estimated marginal means

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

a Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Bonferroni.

4.4.2 Achievement

A one-way MANOVA was performed to find out whether there is any significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to achievement level (high achievers, and low achievers). Results revealed that students' achievement levels had a significant effect on the perception of justice [Wilks' $\lambda =$

.97, $F(4, 521) = 4.11$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$]. Table 4.8 contains means and standard deviations of the dimensions of justice with respect to achievement levels.

Table 4.8

The Means and Standard Deviations of the Dimensions of Justice with Respect to the Achievement Levels

Dimensions	Achievement	Mean	SD
Distributive Justice	Low Achievers	2.82	1.00
	High Achievers	2.94	1.03
Interactional Justice	Low Achievers	3.76	.69
	High Achievers	3.78	.70
Procedural Justice	Low Achievers	4.08	.75
	High Achievers	4.10	.81
Retributive Justice	Low Achievers	3.90	.79
	High Achievers	4.13	.81

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) on each dependent variable were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA. The univariate tests revealed significant differences between high achievers and low achievers on retributive justice [$F(1, 524) = 8.92$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$]. The univariate tests failed to reveal significant differences between high and low achievers for distributive, interactional and procedural justice. The means of high achievers and low achievers on four dimensions were compared (Table 4.9). Consistent with the results of univariate tests, mean difference of low and high achievers on retributive justice dimension was significant at the $p < .05$.

Table 4.9

Comparison of the Means of High and Low Achievers on Four Dimensions.

Dimensions	(I) Achievers	(J) Achievers	Mean Difference (I-J)	<i>p</i>
Distributive Justice	Low Achievers	High Achievers	-.12	.23
	High Achievers	Low Achievers	.12	.23
Interactional Justice	Low Achievers	High Achievers	-.02	.76
	High Achievers	Low Achievers	.02	.76
Procedural Justice	Low Achievers	High Achievers	-.02	.84
	High Achievers	Low Achievers	.02	.84
Retributive Justice	Low Achievers	High Achievers	-.23	.00
	High Achievers	Low Achievers	.23	.00

4.4.3 Mother education level and father education level

A two-way MANOVA was performed to find out whether there is any significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice with respect to mother education, father education and the interaction of mother and father education. This analysis revealed that mother education did not have a significant effect on student's perception of justice [Wilks' $\lambda = .99$, $F(8, 1024) = .37$, $p = .93$, $\eta^2 = .00$]. MANOVA analysis also revealed that father education did not have a significant effect on student's perception of justice [Wilks' $\lambda = .98$, $F(8, 1024) = 1.01$, $p = .43$, $\eta^2 = .01$]. Besides, interaction between father and mother education did not have a significant effect on students' perceptions of justice [Wilks' $\lambda = .97$, $F(16, 1564) = .86$, $p = .60$, $\eta^2 = .01$]. Table 4.10 contains the means and standard deviations of the dimensions of justice with respect to the mother and father educational level.

Table 4.10

The Means and Standard Deviations of the Dimensions of Justice with Respect to the Mother and Father Educational Level

Dimensions	Mother	Father	Mean	SD
Distributive Justice	1,00	1,00	2,98	,99
		2,00	2,72	,98
		3,00	3,08	,96
	2,00	1,00	3,10	1,08
		2,00	2,62	1,02
		3,00	3,07	,96
	3,00	1,00	2,47	,29
		2,00	2,93	1,05
		3,00	2,91	1,04
Interactional Justice	1,00	1,00	3,90	,68
		2,00	3,67	,67
		3,00	3,67	,54
	2,00	1,00	3,90	,55
		2,00	3,69	,69
		3,00	3,77	,68
	3,00	1,00	3,27	,85
		2,00	3,85	,72
		3,00	3,70	,77
Procedural Justice	1,00	1,00	4,15	,81
		2,00	4,09	,68
		3,00	4,22	,81
	2,00	1,00	4,08	,87
		2,00	4,16	,68
		3,00	4,21	,73
	3,00	1,00	4,00	,44
		2,00	4,00	,86
		3,00	3,97	,87
Retributive Justice	1,00	1,00	4,10	,77
		2,00	3,85	,88
		3,00	4,03	,60
	2,00	1,00	4,11	,73
		2,00	4,013	,75
		3,00	4,17	,73
	3,00	1,00	3,33	1,16
		2,00	4,13	,92
		3,00	4,11	,87

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter includes interpretations of the findings in relation to relevant literature, conclusions drawn from these findings and implications and suggestions for practice and future research.

5.1 Discussion of the results

This study aimed to investigate primary school students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences.

One of the purposes of this study was to identify the dimensions of justice perceived by students. Principal Component Analysis that was performed to detect structure among items revealed four meaningful dimensions in the scale. These dimensions were named as (1) distributive justice, (2) interactional justice, (3) procedural justice and (4) retributive justice. The distributive justice dimension consisted of items which were related to the perceived fairness of outcomes. Interactional justice dimension was consisted of items by which the fairness of treatment was evaluated. Procedural justice dimension contained items which were related to the evaluation of the fairness of how resource allocation decisions are made. Last, retributive justice dimension included items in which the return was evaluated according to deserves and merits.

5.1.1 Difference among Perceived Dimensions of Justice

One of the purposes of this study is to examine the difference among perceived dimensions of justice.

Results indicated that there was a significant mean difference among perceived dimensions of justice. The greatest mean difference was observed between procedural justice and distributive justice. The dimensions can be arranged, in terms of mean differences, as procedural ($M= 4.10$), retributive justice (4.06), interactional justice (3.78), and distributive justice ($M=2.90$). As mentioned earlier, items were scored from 1 to 5, with 5 representing a just/fair school environment.

According to the result, students perceived their school practices most fair with respect to procedural and retributive justice.

Procedural justice dimension included items related to the evaluations of procedures of outcomes such as “exam grading is unfair”, “grading is fair”, and “the grading of the project and performance homework is unfair.” Besides, retributive justice dimension consisted of items related to the evaluation of return with respect to merit and deserve such as “the student who is punished certainly has a fault and deserved the punishment”, “a student who gets a low grade has deserved this grade”. Both dimensions have items related to the student’s evaluations of teachers’ and principals’ procedures of evaluating students’ studies and behaviors. According to results, students perceive high degrees of justice regarding teachers’ and principals’ evaluations of their studies and behaviors, perhaps because they trust teachers’ and principals’ ability to evaluate their studies and behaviors. In their study, Chory-Assad and Paulsel (2004) found that students’ perception of procedural justice was negatively associated with their intentions to resist by dishonesty and revenge; and students who perceive higher degrees of procedural justice are less inclined to deceive their teachers than average.

Contrary to the procedural and retributive justice, students perceived their school environment least fair with respect to distributive justice. Distributive justice dimension includes items related to the evaluation of distributions of the outcomes such as “showing more concern to the students with high grades”, “praising some students more than others”, and “punishing some students more severely than others though they have the same fault”. In equity theory, Adams (1965) revealed that individuals evaluate and compare what they receive (e.g. grade) to a standard or to the outcome received by a referent (e.g. classmate). Hence, it may be easier for students to make evaluations on distributions of outcomes with respect to the procedures of outcome distributions. Thus, this may be the reason behind students’ perceptions of lower degrees of distributive justice. This result may also be interpreted in that way the outcomes like grade are more concrete than the procedures of these outcomes. Hence, it is easier for students to evaluate the outcomes in hand. In addition to that, since the outcomes have greater effect on students’ life, they may attach more importance to the outcomes.

In her study, Tata (1999) examined the connection between the fairness of the grade distributions, the fairness of grading procedures and evaluations of the instructor. The results indicated that the fairness of grading procedures did not influence students' evaluations of the instructor to a greater extent than the fairness of grade distributions. Tata (1999) explained this finding with respect to the students' short term relations with the schools and teachers. Thus, they may emphasize grade distributions to a greater extent than grading procedures in their evaluations.

5.1.2 Difference among Perceived Dimensions of Justice with Respect to Certain Background Variables

Gender

The results indicated that gender has a significant effect on the perceived dimensions of justice. This finding was consistent with the result of Kaldırım (2003) which indicated a gender difference on the comprehension of equity dimension of democracy.

The findings revealed that compared to male students, females perceived their school environment more fair. The results of the contrast tests revealed that the greatest mean difference was found between female and male students' perceptions of retributive justice. That is, females maintained more vigorously than males that students receive what they deserve. In addition to that, female students perceive their school environment the most fair with respect to retributive justice. However, male students' choice of dimension of justice which they perceive to be fairer than others was procedural justice. It should be noted that both female and male students perceived their school environments the least fair with respect to distributive justice.

In their study, Brockner and Adsit (1986, cited in Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, p.284) found gender differences in the conditions of distributive justice such that males reacted more strongly than females to inequitable outcomes.

The reason behind this perception difference between male and female students cannot exactly be verified with using this data. However, the perception difference based on gender may indicate a difference in the practices such as attitudes of

teachers in favour of female students. In addition, female students may have more positive attitudes towards school than males.

EGREES (2001) investigated 15 year-old students' perceptions of support provided by their teachers. Perceptions of boys and girls were compared, and it was found that for 10 of the 15 EU Member States, the responses of girls are significantly more positive than of boys. It was concluded that this difference based on gender, even if it is only perceived, may indicate that girls feel that they have more support from their teachers. This result is in line with the finding of the present study in which female students were found to have a more positive perception of justice in their schools.

Leventhal and Lane (1970, cited in Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, p. 283) found that males and females have different anticipations of justice. Specifically, while males' major concern in reward allocation was protecting their own interests, females' major concern in reward allocation was maintaining the welfare of all group members. Thus, female students' sensitivity to protect the harmony of the group and male students' attempts to protect their own benefit may explain the significant difference between female and male students' perceptions of justice.

Achievement

Results indicated that students had different perceptions of justice with respect to their achievement level. As mentioned earlier, achievement was taken as a categorical variable with categories of high achievers and low achievers.

When the mean differences between high achievers and low achievers were examined, it was seen that high achievers perceive their school experiences more fair than low achievers. This result was consistent with the results of the project namely EGREES (2001) in which general perception of justice at school was examined and the biggest difference was found among pupils with low marks, who were much more critical than the rest of their schoolmates in relation to their perception of justice at school. Furthermore, this result is true for each dimension of justice. However, when the dimensions were tested individually with respect to achievement, the only significant difference was found between high achievers' and low achievers' perceptions of retributive justice. This result suggested that high achievers perceived

their school environment more fair than the low achievers with respect to retributive justice. That is, while high achievers thought that students receive what they deserve regarding grades, punishment, and respect, low achievers thought that students do not receive what they deserve.

Mother and Father Education

One of the purposes of this study was to investigate students' perceptions of justice with respect to mother and father educational level. Results indicated that mother education level (middle school & below, secondary education, university & higher) did not have a significant effect on the students' perceptions of justice. Likewise, students' perceptions of justice did not vary with respect to the father education level. Lastly, the interaction between father and mother education level did not have a significant effect on students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences.

Contrary to this result, in her study, Kaldırım (2003) found that students' perceptions of the equity dimension of democracy showed significant difference according to mother and father education. Kaldırım (2003) interpreted this finding as while the parents' level of education gets higher, equity dimension of democracy is perceived better.

The present study examined students' perceptions of justice based on their school experiences. However, Kaldırım (2003) examined students' perceptions of democracy based public life. This difference between studies may be the reason behind the contradicting results.

5.2 Conclusions and Implications

The findings of this study indicated that primary school students perceived their school experiences most fair with respect to procedural and retributive justice. In contrast, they perceived their school experiences least fair with respect to distributive justice. It can be derived from this result that students attach more importance to the distribution of outcomes. This conclusion leads to important implications for practice. Teachers and principals should inform students about the rationale behind the distribution of outcomes such as grade, praise or punishment. For instance, they

should acquaint all students with the explanation of why a particular student or a group of students get rewarded, praised or punished. It is also suggested that this explanation takes place in a democratic environment where students who are the future citizens will have the opportunity to state their reflections freely. As it was mentioned in the literature review, schools are the mini-societies where students should gain democratic abilities. The development of enlightened democratic citizens requires both a curriculum that includes the instruction of the meaning of democracy, and a suitable school environment where students will practice their democratic abilities.

Another result of this study revealed that compared to male students, female students perceived their school environment more fair. This result may be explained with the attitudes of teachers in favour of girls or with the more positive attitudes of female students towards school. It is suggested to teachers and principals that they regard male students' sensitivity to justice.

Results also revealed that high achievers perceived their school experiences more fair than the low achievers. The results of the univariate tests revealed that high achievers perceived their school environment more fair than the low achievers with respect to retributive justice. That is, while high achievers thought that students receive what they deserve regarding grades, punishment, and respect, low achievers thought that students do not receive what they deserve. Considering this result, it may be suggested that curriculum developers and teachers should pay attention to the students' comprehension of the concept of justice. That is, students should be able to differentiate justice which is a matter of ethical judgment from equality which is a matter of fact (Bronfenbrenner, 1973). In that way, students will have higher abilities of evaluating their experiences with respect to justice.

It is crucial that teachers determine standards and rules. They should inform students about the rules and procedures at the beginning of the year. Students should get the clear ideas about the rules. They should also have opportunity to criticize them. If students feel that they are rewarded, praised, punished or get their grades with respect to certain rules and procedures, they may perceive their school environment more positive and fair.

Overall it can be concluded that the findings of the present study on students' perception of justice may enable teachers, principals and policy makers to look at the matters from students' perspective. This may help them to meet students' needs and expectations and to decrease students' aggression and resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness.

Several implications for future research can be drawn from the findings of the present study. It is hoped that this study leads up to new studies in which different variables such as family background or personality trait will be included. Additionally, in this study only students' perceptions of justice were considered. However, parents' perceptions can also be investigated.

In this study, only public school students' perceptions of justice were investigated. A similar study may be conducted with including private school students. Such a study is essential as it will reveal the differences between public and private school social environments and students' perceptions of justice.

This study may also lead to studies to be done at different schooling levels since it is probable that students at different schooling levels – primary, secondary, and university- and grades may have varying perceptions of justice.

Since this study showed us that primary school students perceived their school experiences least fair with respect to distributive justice, further studies may investigate deeply the reasons behind this result and further experimental studies may explore the ways to increase degrees of students' perceptions of distributive justice.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. J. (2005). Efficiency, equity, and voice as moral imperatives. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 17(2), 111-117.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, (pp. 267-299), New York: Academic Press.
- Archard, D. (2003). Citizenship education and multiculturalism. In A. Lockyer, C. Bernard & J. Annette (Eds.), *Education for democratic citizenship* (pp.89-103). Ashgate:Aldershot.
- Arturo, L. (n.d.). Implementing agenda 21: Sustainable development and world citizenship. UN-NGLS. Retrieved November 18, 2007, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/html4/loose.dtd/>
- Bies, R.J. (2001). Interactional justice: the sacred and the profane. In A Greenberg J. & Cropanzano, R. (Eds.), *Advances in organizational justice*, (pp.89-118), California: Stanford University Pres.
- Black, K. (2000). *Understanding Equity and Oppression from a different perspective: Students Evaluate Their Education*. Unpublished master's thesis, Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario.
- Bottery, M. (1990) Children, the management of schools and political literacy. *Oxford Review of Education*, 16, 235-244.
- Bottery, M. (2000). Values education. In A R. Bailey (Ed.) *Teaching values & citizenship across the curriculum: educating children for the world* (pp. 3-14). Glasgow: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bronfenbrenner, M. (1973). Equality and equity. *Annals American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 409, 8-23.
- Brown, D. Bereznicki, B. & Zbar, V. (2003). *The Values Education Study: Final Report*. Carlton South Victoria: Curriculum Corporation.
- Crick Report (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools*. Final report of the advisory group on citizenship, London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

- Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004). Classroom justice: Student aggression and resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness. *Communication Education*, 53, 253-273.
- Chory-Assad, R.M. & Paulsel M. L. (2005). Perceptions of instructor interactional justice as a predictor of student resistance. *Communication Research Reports*, 22(4), 283-291.
- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, P. E. (2001). The role of justice in organizations: a meta-analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 86(2), 278–321.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Justice*, (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Çayır, K. (2003). Ders kitaplarında insan hakları ve demokrasi bilinci. In B. Çotuksöken, A. Erzan, & O. Silier (Eds), *Ders kitaplarında insan hakları: tarama sonuçları*, (90-105). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.
- Davidow, M. (2003). Have you heard the word? The effect of word of mouth on perceived justice, satisfaction and repurchase intentions following complaint handling. *Journal of Consumer Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction and Complaining Behavior*, 16, 67-80.
- Department of Educational and Science (1988) Education Reform Act 1988, Ch. 40, Part 1.2 (b). London, HMSO.
- Dewey, J. (1915). *The school and society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- EGREES (2005). Equity in European educational systems: a set of indicators. *European Educational Research Journal*, 4(2), 1-151.
- Eurydice (2005). Citizenship education at school in europe. Brussels: Eurydice. Retrieved September 18, 2007, from www.eurydice.org/ressources/Eurydice/pdf/0_integral/055EN.pdf
- Erdem, A.R. (2005). İlköğretimimizin gelişimi ve bugün gelinen nokta. *Bilim Eğitim ve Düşünce Dergisi*, 5, 2. Retrieved September 18, 2007, from <http://www.universite-toplum.org/text.php3?id=240/>
- Field, A. P. (2005). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

- Fisher, D., Waldrip, B., & Brok, P. (2005). Students' perceptions of primary teachers' interpersonal behavior and of cultural dimensions in the classroom environment. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 43, 25–38.
- Frazer, E. (2002). Citizenship education: anti-political culture and political education in Britain. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Education for democracy: contexts, curricula, assessments*. (pp.27-43). Connecticut: IAP.
- Griffiths, M. (1998). The disclosures of social justice in schools. *British Educational Research Journal*, 24 (3), 301-317.
- Gore, J. (2001). *Bridging the gap: a case for democratic schools*. APAPDC Online conference. Retrieved October 16, 2008, from www.curriculumsupport.education.nsw.gov.au/.../hsie/assets/crosscurriculum/civics/occpapers/demschools.pdf
- Gözütok, F.D. (2003). *Hukuk ilintili yurttaşlık eğitimi*. Conference proceedings of the Hukuk Öğretimi ve Hukukçunun Eğitimi held in Ankara. Conducted by the Türkiye Barolar Birliği. Retrieved October 16, 2008, from www.barobirlik.org.tr/yayinlar/makaleler/dilekgozutok.doc/
- Greenberg, J. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 9-22.
- Colquitt, J. A., Greenberg, J., & Zapata-Phelan, C. P. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview of the field. In J. Greenberg & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), *The handbook of organizational justice* (pp. 3-56). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Halstead, J. M. & Taylor, M. J. (2000). Learning and teaching about values: a review of recent research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(2), 169-202.
- Halstead J. M. & Mark A. P. (2006). *Citizenship and moral education: values in action*. London: Routledge.
- Hine, J. (2004). *Children and citizenship*. Home Office online report. Retrieved October 16, 2008, from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/rdsolr0804.pdf/>
- Hullfish, H.G. (1960). *Toward a democratic education*. Tokyo: The Institute for Democratic Education.
- Hyttén, K. (2006). Education for social justice: provocations and challenges. *Educational Theory*, 56(2), 221-236.

- Ichilov, O. (1998). *Citizenship & citizenship education in a changing world*. The Woburn Press: London.
- Kabanoff, B. (1991). Equity, equality, power, and conflict. *Academy of Management Review*. 16 (2), 416-441.
- Kaldırım, E. (2003). *The democracy perception of 8th graders*. Unpublished master's thesis, Gazi University, Ankara.
- Kerr, D. (1999). Citizenship education: an international comparison (international review of curriculum and assessment frameworks). London: QCA. Retrieved May 21, 2007 from www.inca.org.uk/pdf/citizenship_no_intro.pdf
- Kolm, S.C. (1996). *Modern theories of justice*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2003). Two dilemmas of citizenship education in pluralist societies. In A. Lockyer, C. Bernard & J. Annette (Eds.), *Education for democratic citizenship*, (pp. 3-63). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Leventhal, G. S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the fairness in social relationships. In K. J. Gergen, M. S. Greenberg, & R. H. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: advances in theory and research* (pp. 27–55). New York: Plenum.
- Lockyer, A. (2003). The political status of children and young people. In A. Lockyer, C. Bernard & J. Annette (Eds.), *Education for democratic citizenship* (pp. 120-139). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Maiese, M. (2004). Retributive justice. beyond intractability. In G. Burgess & H. Burgess (Eds.), *Conflict Research Consortium*, Boulder: University of Colorado. Retrieved October 16, 2008, from http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/retributive_justice/
- Marshall, T.H. (1950). Citizenship and social class. In T. H. Marshall and T. Bottomore (Eds.), *Citizenship and social class*, (pp. 3-51). London: Pluto Press.
- McGrath, S. (1993). Equity and efficiency in educational finance: An operational conundrum. Retrieved January 25, 2008 from: <http://www.mun.ca/educ/faculty/mwatch/vol1/mcgrath2.html>
- Michelli N.M., Keiser D. L. (2005). *Teacher education for democracy and social justice*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

- National Center for Education Statistics (2001). What democracy means to ninth-graders: U.S. Results from the International IEA Civic Education Study. Retrieved May 16, 2007, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001096.pdf/>
- UN-NGLS (1997). Implementing agenda 21: sustainable development and world citizenship. Retrieved January 20, 2008 from: <http://www.un-ngls.org/documents/publications.en/agenda21/09.htm/>
- Uslu, M. (2003). *Education of democracy in the secondary schools: the level of democratic behaviors of students and teachers*. Unpublished master's thesis, Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Parker, C. W. (2002). Introduction. In W. C. Parker (Ed.), *Education for democracy: contexts, curricula, assessments*, (p. vii-xv) Research in Social Education. Connecticut: IAP.
- Patterson, M. A. (2002). *Community schools in community development: democracy, education, and social change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The State University of New Jersey, New Jersey.
- Paulsel, M.L., Chory-Assad, R.M. & Dunleavy, K.N. (2005). The relationship between student perceptions of instructor power and classroom justice. *Communication Research Reports*, 22(3), 207-215.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rawnsley, D. G. (1997). *Associations between classroom learning environments, teacher interpersonal behavior and student outcomes in secondary Mathematics classrooms*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Curtin University, Sydney.
- Ross W. D. (1908). *Aristotle: nicomachean ethics*. Translated by W. D. Ross Oxford, Clarendon Press. Retrieved January 15, 2008 from: <http://www.ilt.columbia.edu/Publications/Projects/digitexts/aristotle/nicomacheanethics/book02.html/>
- Ross, W. D. (1877). *Aristotle*. (6th ed.) London: Routledge.
- Smith, E. & Gorard, S. (2006). Pupils' views of equity in education. *Compare*, 36(1), 41-56.
- Snauwaert, D. T. (2002). Cosmopolitan Democracy and Democratic Education. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 4(2), 5-15.

- Tata, J. (1999). Grade distributions, grade procedures, and students' evaluations of instructors: a justice perspective. *The Journal of Psychology*, 133(3), 263-271.
- Thibaut, J. W., & Walker, L. (1978). A theory of procedure. *California Law Review*, 66, 541-566.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen. Delft: IEA.
- Tse, K.C. (2001). Society and citizenship education in transition: the case of Macau. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 21, 305-314.
- Weerd, M., Gemmeke, M., Rigter, J. & Rij, C. (2005). Final report: indicators for monitoring active citizenship and citizenship education. Regioplan: Netherlands. Retrieved September 10, 2008, from http://ec.europa.eu/education/pdf/doc280_en.pdf
- Whisenant, W. & Jordan, J. S. (2008). Fairness and enjoyment in school sponsored youth sports. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 43(1), 91-100.
- Wilkins, C. (2000). Citizenship education. In R. Bailey (Ed.), *Teaching values & citizenship across the curriculum* (pp. 14-27). Oxon: RoutledgeFalmer.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE NAMES OF THE SCHOOLS AND NUMBER OF STUDENTS

Name of School	N
1. Aydınlık Evler Primary School	124
2. Ayten Şaban Diri Primary School	76
3 Ayyıldız Primary School	93
4 Çankaya Primary School	58
5 İhsan Sungu Primary School	55
6 Nebahat Taşkın Primary School	51
7 Yasemin Karakaya Primary School	69
Total	526

APPENDIX B

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

1. How do you define justice?
2. How do teachers treat students in your school?
3. How do you define a just teacher?
4. How is the grading procedure in your school?
5. Is there anything you want to add to or eliminate from grading procedure?
6. Do you feel easy while you contact and talk to your teachers?
7. Is there discrimination among students in your school?
8. In what circumstances students are punished in your school? Can you give an example?
9. Are students punished fairly in your school?
10. Think about this year and the previous ones. Can you tell us an event in which a student was punished unfairly? Who was the person that acted unfairly? What happened at the end?

APPENDIX C

ÖĞRENCİLERİN EŞİTLİK ALGILARI ANKETİ

Değerli öğrencimiz, bu anket ilköğretim okullarındaki 6. 7. ve 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin eşitlik kavramı üzerine neler düşündüğünü anlamak amacıyla hazırlanmıştır.

Lütfen soruları dikkatlice okuyunuz ve hepsini cevaplamaya özen gösteriniz. Doldurduğunuz anketi sadece araştırmacı inceleyecektir. Adınızı yazmanız gerekmektedir. Herhangi bir sorunuz olursa, benimle iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Katkılarınızdan dolayı şimdiden teşekkür ederim.

Tülay ÇELİKKAYA
ODTÜ Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü
Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

1. **Okulun Adı:** _____
2. **Sınıf:** _____
3. **Cinsiyet:** K E
4. **Geçen dönemki not ortalaması:** _____
5. **Annenin ve babanın eğitim durumu:** (Anneniz ve babanız için birer kutu işaretleyiniz.)

	Anne	Baba
1.Okur-yazar değil	<input type="checkbox"/> 1	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
2.Okur-yazar ama bir okul bitirmedi	<input type="checkbox"/> 2	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
3.İlkokul mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> 3	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
4.Ortaokul mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
5.Lise Mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
6.Üniversite mezunu	<input type="checkbox"/> 6	<input type="checkbox"/> 6
7.Üniversite Üstü (Master&Doktora)	<input type="checkbox"/> 7	<input type="checkbox"/> 7

6. **Evinizde ders kitapları dışında yaklaşık kaç kitap var?(Sadece bir kutu işaretleyiniz.)**

Hiç yok	<input type="checkbox"/> 1
1 - 10.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 2
11 - 50.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 3
51 - 100.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 4
101 - 200.....	<input type="checkbox"/> 5
200'den fazla	<input type="checkbox"/> 6

Lütfen aşağıdaki her bir cümle için, bunların okulunuzda ne sıklıkla meydana geldiğini en iyi ifade eden sayıyı işaretleyiniz.		Hiçbir zaman	Nadiren	Bazen	Sık sık	Her zaman
Benim okulumda;		*	**	***	****	*****
1	Notlandırma adildir.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Bazı öğrenciler diğerlerinden daha fazla övülürler.	1	2	3	4	5
3	Kız ve erkek öğrencilere eşit davranılır.	1	2	3	4	5
4	Cezalandırılan öğrenci bir suç işlemiş ve bu cezayı hak etmiştir.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Proje ve performans ödevleri notlandırılırken haksızlık yapılır.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Her zaman aynı öğrenciler övülür ve ödüllendirilir.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Öğretmenler her öğrenciyle iyi iletişim kurmaya çalışırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Sınavlar notlandırılırken haksızlık yapılır.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Öğretmenler bütün öğrencilere aynı ilgiyi gösterirler.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Öğretmenler söz hakkı verirken herkese eşit davranırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Öğretmenler bütün öğrencilere nazik davranırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
12	Her öğrenci hak ettiği notu alır.	1	2	3	4	5
13	Hak eden her öğrenci ayırım yapmadan cezalandırılır.	1	2	3	4	5
14	Öğretmenler yüksek not alan öğrencilerle daha çok ilgilenirler.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Bir öğrenci hak ettiği için övülür ve ödüllendirilir.	1	2	3	4	5
16	Öğretmenler yüksek not alan öğrencilere daha nazik/saygılı davranırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Yüksek not alan öğrenci aldığı notu hak ediyordur.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Yanlış davranışta bulunmadıkça bütün öğrenciler saygı görürler.	1	2	3	4	5

19	Aynı suçu işlese de bazı öğrenciler diğerlerine göre daha büyük cezalar alırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
20	Ödüllendirilen veya övülen bir öğrenci bu ilgiyi hak etmiştir.	1	2	3	4	5
21	Her zaman aynı öğrenciler cezalandırılır.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Düşük not alan bir öğrenci bu notu hak etmiştir.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Öğretmenler notları düşük olan öğrencilerle daha çok ilgilenirler.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Her öğrenci eşit şekilde övülür ve ödüllendirilir.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Öğretmenler bazı öğrencilere daha çok söz hakkı verirler.	1	2	3	4	5