

Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice - 12(2) • Spring • 766-771

2012 Educational Consultancy and Research Center

www.edam.com.tr/esto

# Knowledge Level of Pre-Service Teachers in the Faculty of Education about Student Rights

# Cem TOPSAKAL<sup>a</sup>

Yüzüncü Yıl University

#### Abstract

As regards this study, it was aimed to determine the knowledge level of pre-service teachers in YYU faculty of education about student rights. The population of the study consisted of 3538 undergraduates in 2010-2011 academic year of YYU. By stratified and multi-phase sampling, 538 students from all departments and grades were randomly selected. As a data collection tool, "Student Rights Knowledge Survey" which was developed the researcher, was used. The data were analysed by using SPSS statistical package. The survey was examined in terms of factorial structure and model appropriateness through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. As a result, it was found out that the rights' knowledge of prospective teachers studying at faculty of education was over the level. Another finding showed that they were knowledgeable enough about educational rights, registration rights, exemption and seeking justice, average about social rights and course selection. According to another finding, female students were more knowledgeable about seeking justice, educational rights and exemption rights, FAPT students had more knowledge about seeking justice rights than science students, and science students had less knowledge about educational rights than FAPT students and social students. It was also seen that junior students had less knowledge about social rights than senior students, freshman students had less knowledge about course selection rights than junior and senior students. The current research was ended by results and discussion.

## **Key Words**

Student Rights, University Students, Faculty of Education, Knowledge about Rights.

Right is a benefit of an individual for being protected which is described by law (Akıntürk, 2008). Law defines an order; right, on the other hand refers to a benefit protected by law (Akyüz, 2006). The right gives individuals necessary power and opportunities about a subject, provides freedom about behaving and acting according to law or not, and means legal usage which can be used against others (individuals, groups, society, delegates of

a Cem TOPSAKAL, Ph.D., is currently an assistant professor in the field of Educational Sciences. His research interests are educational law, democracy and human rights, child rights, education policies of the European Union, and Kosovo's education system. Correspondence: Yüzüncü Yıl University, Faculty of Education, Department of Primary Education, Van/ Turkey. E-mail: cemtopsakal@yyu.edu.tr; topsakal34@yahoo.com Phone: +90 432 2251370/1735 Fax: +90 432 225 1368.

society, humanity) (Tice, 1976). The rights are divided into two as public rights and private rights (Karaman Kepenekçi, 2004, 2008). Public rights are also divided into two: Generally qualified public rights and specially qualified public rights (Akyüz, 2006). Student rights are specially qualified public rights. Each right bases on a law rule. Each right has an owner. Beings that have rights are called as individuals in law (Akıntürk, 2008). College students studying at a university have rights as being individuals. Student rights, from general to specific, are human rights, participation rights in organizations and structural and other legal rights (Tice). It is possible to order these rights in the specialty of university as educational, participation, seeking justice, social, cultural rights (Resmi Gazete, 2010). Student rights are found first in forensic documents and national legislation.

According to Universal Declaration of Human Rights accepted in December 10, 1948, each individual has the educational right. Education should be free at least during basic educational grades. Basic education is compulsory. Everyone should benefit from technical and vocational education. Higher education, on the other hand, should be open to every person according to their abilities (Şişman, 2006; Tice, 1976). International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights adopted by United Nations made Universal Declaration of Human Rights strengthened. The covenant, which was accepted on December 16, 1966, became effective on January 3, 1976. In the covenant, educational right was regulated comprehensively, and by the covenant countries were nominated to form basic facilities of educational system and to provide educational organizations and opportunities (Sencer, 1988). One of the international contracts related to education is United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. The convention was accepted by United Nations on November 20, 1989. It was inured in Turkey by the Official Journal of dated 27.01.1995 and numbered 22184 (Resmi Gazete, 1995). The convention became an internal source of law in relation to 90 of the Constitution article (Özdemir Uluç, 2008). The aim of the convention is to identify universal principals for protection and development of children, to protect them against all kinds of neglect, abuse and misconduct. Also, it is intended to form a frame which provides children programs for the development of their potentials and abilities (Akyüz, 2010). The Treaty of Amsterdam which integrated all other European treaties, made two crucial regulations regarding education. Those regulations are the 149 and 150 of the Treaty article. The articles put forth education and educational policies for consideration (Bolayır, 2000; Topsakal, 2003). Education was taken into consideration in the European Union Constitution (the Lisbon Treaty) that was accepted in 2009, and by Life-long Learning Program, student rights were determined (T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Başkanlığı, 2010). Educational freedom was acknowledged in the European Convention on Human Rights which was prepared by the European Commission to protect human rights globally, and became effective in September 3, 1953 (Karaman Kepenekçi, 2008). The goal of education in international educational law can be expressed as to reinforce respect for human rights and freedom, to strengthen personal development, to make individuals take part in a free society actively, and to spread mutual friendship, understanding and tolerance (UNICEF, 2007).

Educational right was handled as a social basic right in the 1982 Constitution as a national legislation (Akyüz, 2006; Karaman Kepenekçi, 2006). Individual application to the Supreme Court was acknowledged after September 12, 2010 referendum with a new regulation (Arslan & Kayançicek, 2010). The Turkish Educational System is being carried out according to the principals of the 14.06.1973 dated and 1739 numbered National Education Basic Law (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB], 2007). Some goals in the Law such as general goals (e.g. raising citizens, personality development, professional development), specific goals (e.g. goals of preschool education, elementary, secondary, higher education and non-formal education), and some principles as universality and equality, orientation, educational right, and opportunity and facility equality are related to student rights (Akyüz, 2006). Education and students are identified in seventh section of the Law of Higher Education (Alışkan, 2007). Student rights take part in student regulations (Resmi Gazete, 2010).

It is observed in the related literature that student rights are handled according to both in general and levels of education (Abinanti & Tripp & Arcata CA, 1976; Aydın, 2003a; Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1974; Indiana University, 2011; Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1976; Wood, Kelley, Test, & Fowler, 2010). Another study focused on academic rights in American colleges (Horowitz, 2010). Student rights and responsibilities at the Technical University of Varna, Bulgaria were gathered in a guide (Varna Teknik Üniversitesi, 2011). Turkish educational institutions take some decisions about student rights and responsibilities as seen on studies abroad (Ankara Üniversitesi, 2001; Aydın, 2003b; Koç Üniversitesi, 2011). In a study focused on beliefs of high school students in America about which rights they had and which rights they did not, it was found out that although they gave ironic, funny and full of surprises responses, most of the students had knowledge of their rights. The other finding of this study was the manifestation of level of knowledge of rights (Kriebel, 2003). In another study which was conducted in the USA and focused on the importance of student knowledge and awareness of their legal rights, it was concluded that the subject was a necessity for teacher education programs, writing student rights booklets had great importance, and designing in-service trainings for teachers which are related to the subject in order to make them help students become aware of and minimize suffering was another necessity (Simpson, 1980).

## Aim

Reaching views of prospective teachers, who are students at the faculty of education, in order to identify their knowledge level regarding their rights is a crucial subject. Parallel to this, the knowledge level of students who were at the YYU Faculty of Education about their rights forms the main aim of this study. In line with this aim, the research question asking, "What is the knowledge level of the YYU Faculty of Education students about student rights?" was investigated in this study.

#### Method

## Model

In this study, general screening model, which is a descriptive research method, was used.

## Population and Sample

The population of this study was consisted of 3538 students who were at the Yüzüncü Yıl University Faculty of Education. Since it was difficult and costly to reach the population, studying with a sample was decided to be effective. For sample size selection, the table developed by Balcı including theoretical sample sizes for different populations, and 95% significance level was used (Balcı, 2001). According to this table, for 4% tolerable error, necessary sample size for 5000 population size is 535. For this study, the sample size was consisted of 538 students. The departments of students were classified as social, science, and fine arts and physical training (FAPT) according to the related literature (Dönmez & Özer, 2009).

## **Data Collection Tool**

For this study, "The Student Rights Knowledge Survey" was developed by the researcher, and content validity of the tool was conducted (Balcı, 2001). In "The Student Rights Knowledge Survey", in order to make participants analyze given expressions, five-point Likert-type rating scale was used. Knowledge level about the subject was formed by never (1), almost never (2), in between (3), enough (4) and absolutely (5). It is requested from students to identify most suitable alternative for them.

For validity of The Student Rights Knowledge Survey, exploratory factor analysis in relation to construct validity was used (Büyüköztürk, 2003). By exploratory factor analysis which was conducted to assess the factor structure of the Student Rights Knowledge Survey, KMO coefficient of the sample compliance was found to be 0,936, and Bartlett's test of sphericity chi-square value was 7458,89 (p<0.001). With these results, it was concluded that the data of this study would be processed by factor analysis. According to the results of factor analysis which was performed by principal component analysis and varimax rotation, 6 factors were determined to have greater than 1 Eigen values. The total variance explained by these 6 factors was % 59.961. The total variance explained by each factor after rotation, respectively was 16.514; 11.379; 8.995; 8.381; 7.908 and 6.784. Since the goodness of fit index (GFI) and comparative fit index (CFI) values are near to cut-off point (,90) and  $\chi$  <sup>2</sup>/df value is smaller than 5, the confirmatory factor analysis seems to produce a good fit (Duyan & Gelbal, 2008). The scale items were rated on five point scale: 1-1,79 corresponding to never; 1,80-2,59 very rarely; 2,60-3,39 sometimes; 3,40-4,19 very often, and 4,20-5,00 always (Koçakoğlu & Türkmen, 2010).

## **Data Analysis**

Statistical techniques such as mean, standard deviation t-test and ANOVA were used for quantitative data analysis in this study. Knowledge level of prospective teachers about student rights was described by mean and standard deviation calculated for each sub-dimension. In order to test whether knowledge level of prospective teachers about student rights differentiated in relation to gender or not, t-test was conducted; in order to reach information whether this knowledge level differentiated regarding grades of students or not, ANOVA was used.

For data collection, qualitative research method was also used with quantitative method (Cresswell, 1994 as cited in Memduhoğlu, 2010; Patton, 1990 as cited in Memduhoğlu, 2010; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008). The results obtained from the study were revised and converted into an interview protocol in order to get 15 educational administrators' views concerning the topic. While presenting the data, nick names such as "the first participant", the second participant" were used instead of interpreting the real names of administrators. Interviews lasted from 20 minutes to an hour. The researcher took some notes during interviews. These interview notes were analysed according to the findings and then grouped.

## Results and Discussion

The first result according to the findings of this study was that students at the faculty of education had enough knowledge regarding student rights. Educational administrators evaluated this result that students read regulations of their departments from the university's web page, and added that students were also getting information from educational administrators. This result was parallel to the findings of related studies in terms of students' general knowledge level (Tican, 2005) and their lack of knowledge regarding specific knowledge, treatment and detail (Dönmez & Özer, 2009).

The second result based on findings showed that students at the faculty of education had enough knowledge concerning educational rights, registration rights, and exemption and seeking justice rights. However, they had middle-level knowledge about social rights and course selection rights. This result was found to be parallel to related literature (Özden Aras, 2006).

The third result was that female students were more knowledgeable in terms of seeking justice, educational rights and exception and passing the course rights than male students. No significant difference was found between females and males concerning knowledge about social rights, registration rights and course selection rights. The result was also seen to be parallel with related literature (Dönmez & Özer, 2009; Güdek 2007; Gülveren, 2007; Karahan, 2003; Övet, 2006; Özdemir Uluç, 2008; Özden Aras, 2006; Tican, 2005).

The fourth result based on the findings of current study showed that fine arts and physical training (FAPT) students had more knowledge about seeking justice than science students, science students had less knowledge about educational rights than fine arts and physical training (FAPT) and social students, and science students also had less knowledge about social rights than fine arts and physical training (FAPT) and social students. For registration rights, exemption rights and course selection rights, on the other hand, no significant difference was found to be among departments. This result was also supported with related literature (Dönmez & Özer, 2009; Karahan, 2003; Özdemir Uluç, 2008; Türkçapar, 2007).

The fifth result based on the findings was that, regarding social rights, junior students had less knowledge than senior students. In terms of registration rights, freshman students had less knowledge than senior students. Concerning course

selection rights, freshman students had also less knowledge than junior and senior students. No significant difference was found among grades. The result was parallel with related literature (Dönmez & Özer, 2009; Karahan, 2003; Özdemir Uluç, 2008).

## Suggestions

Based on the results, following suggestions can be recommended:

- Student advisors and educational administrators should support the students according to following points:
  - a) To all students about social rights and course selection rights,
  - b) For departments; course selection rights to all departments, and social rights to science and social departments,
  - c) For grades; seeking justice to junior students, social rights to freshman and junior students, and course selection rights to all grades

Student rights seminars can be arranged during the academic year to achieve these points. Members of Office of Legal Affairs from the Rectorate can make contributions to these seminars.

- Orientations can be arranged for freshman students who were found to have less knowledge about registration and course selection rights than upper grade students at the beginning of each academic year.
- A booklet including student rights and advertisement of the university can be distributed to each student during registration.
- 4. Seminars and in-service trainings about practice of student rights can be arranged to student advisors and educational administrators. Members of Office of Legal Affairs from the Rectorate can make contributions while arranging these seminars and in-service trainings.
- This study should be replicated with whole university students, and other educational levels such as elementary and secondary levels.
- The rights are being studied with the responsibilities in the literature. Therefore, these two subjects can be studied together in other researches.

## References/Kaynakça

Abinanti & Tripp & Arcata CA. (1976). Legal rights and responsibilities in the public schools: A handbook for teachers in california schools (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 199004).

Akıntürk, T. (2008). *Hukuka giriş*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Akyüz, E. (2006). Eğitimin hukuki temelleri. Ş.Ş. Erçetin-N. Tozlu (Ed.), *Eğitim bilimine giriş* kitabı içinde (65-112). Ankara: Hegem Yayınları.

Akyüz, E. (2010). Çocuk hukuku: Çocukların hakları ve korunması. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Alışkan, M. (2007). Yükseköğretim mevzuatı. İstanbul: Yaylım Yayıncılık

Ankara Üniversitesi. (2001). Ankara üniversitesi öğrenci hakları ve sorumlulukları. http://ilef.ankara.edu.tr/yazi.php?yad=2580 adresinden 15.02.2011 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Arslan, Ç. ve Kayançicek, M. (2010). *T.C. anayasası*. İstanbul: Hürriyet Gazetesi Yayınları.

Aydın, İ. (2003a). Eğitim ve öğretimde etik. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

Aydın, İ. (2003b). Tıp fakültelerinin eğitim işlevi ve etik: Tıp fakültesi öğrencilerinin hak ve sorumlulukları. *C. Ü. Tıp Fakültesi Dergisi* 25 (4), 2003 Özel Eki, 12-15.

Balcı, A. (2001). Sosyal bilimlerde araştırma: Yöntem, teknik ve ilkeler. Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.

Bolayır, C. (2000). *Amsterdam antlaşması*. İstanbul: İktisadî Kalkınma Vakfı Yayınları.

Bureau of Indian Affairs. (1974). Student rights and responsibilities: A progress report. Research and evaluation report series No. 25-B. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 093539).

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2003). Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı: İstatistik, araştırma deseni, SPSS uygulamaları ve yorum. Ankara: Pegem A Yayınları.

Dönmez, B. ve Özer, N. (2009). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin üniversite yönetimine ilişkin bilgi düzeyleri. *Milli Eğitim, 184*, 44.69

Duyan, V. ve Gelbal, S. (2008). Barnett çocuk sevme ölçeğini Türkçeye uyarlama çalışması. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 33 (148), 40-48.

Güdek, B. (2007). Eğitim fakültesi müzik eğitimi anabilim dalı 1. ve 4. sınıf öğrencilerinin müzik öğretmenliği mesleğine yönelik tutumlarının öğrenciye ait farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Gülveren, H. (2007). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin eleştirel düşünme becerileri ve bu becerileri etkileyen eleştirel düşünme faktörleri. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İzmir.

Horowitz, D. (2010). *Academic bill of rights*. Retrieved 15 February, 2011 from https://webspace.utexas.edu/hcleaver/www/3 30T/350kPEEHorowitzAcadBillTable.pdf

Indiana University. (2011). The code part I: Student rights. Retrieved 15 February, 2011 from http://www.indiana.edu/~code/code/rights/employment/index.shtml.

Karahan, E. (2003). Öğretmen adaylarının öğretmenlik tutumları açısından incelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Karaman Kepenekçi, Y. (2004). Hukuk ve öğretmenlik mesleği. M. D. Karslı (Ed.), Ö*ğretmenlik mesleğine giriş* kitabı içinde (s. 179-204). Ankara: Öğreti Yayıncılık. Karaman Kepenekçi, Y. (2006). Türkiye'de eğitim hukuku. M. Hesapçıoğlu ve A. Durmuş (Ed.), Türkiye'de eğitim bilimleri: Bir bilanço denemesi kitabı içinde (s. 298-311). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Karaman Kepenekçi, Y. (2008). Eğitimciler için insan hakları ve vatandaşlık. Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınevi.

Koç Üniversitesi. (2011). Koç üniversitesi öğrenci davranış kuralları.

http://www.ku.edu.tr/ku/index.php?Itemid=3080&id=215 0&option=com\_content&task=view&lang=tr, adresinden 15.02.2011 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Koçakoğlu, M. ve Türkmen, L. (2010). Biyoloji dersine yönelik tutum ölçeği geliştirilmesi. Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 2 (2), 229-245.

Kriebel, A. (2003). We have rihts? Bucks County Courier Times (Levittown, PA). May 1, 2003 Reality Preprint Edition 1, 4pp. NewsBank-Archives. Erişim numarası: 0FE9EE438441A7A7.

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı (MEB). (2007). *Milli eğitim temel kanu-nu*. http://okulweb.meb.gov.tr/35/02/812358/tmeb.doc, adresinden 06.10.2007 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Memduhoğlu, H. B. (2010). Eğitimin bilimsel temelleri ve araştırma yöntemleri. H. B. Memduhoğlu ve K. Yılmaz (Ed.), Eğitim bilimine giriş içinde (s. 189-216). Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.

Övet, O. (2006). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğini tercih etmelerinde etkili olan faktörlerin belirlenmesi. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Özdemir Uluç, F. (2008). İlköğretim programlarında çocuk hakları. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Özden Aras, H. (2006). Ankara üniversitesi eğitim bilimleri fakültesi öğrencilerinin siyasal, ekonomik, toplumsal ve kültürel ilgi alanları. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Resmi Gazete. (1995). Birleşmiş milletler çocuk haklarına dair sözleşme. 27.01.1995 tarih ve 22184 sayılı.

Resmi Gazete. (2010). Yüzüncü yıl üniversitesi önlisans ve lisans eğitim-öğretim ve sınav yönetmeliği. 13 Mayıs 2010 tarih ve 27580 sayılı.

Sencer, M. (1988). *Belgelerle insan hakları*. İstanbul: Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım A.Ş.

Simpson, R. J. (1980). Teaching about students rights. *Jurnal of Teacher Education*, 31 (3), 57-60.

Şişman, M. (2006). *Eğitim bilimine giriş* (2. bs). Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.

T.C. Başbakanlık Devlet Planlama Başkanlığı. (2010). *Hayatbo-yu öğrenme*. http://www.ua.gov.tr/index.cfm?dil=TR. adresinden 19.07.2010 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Tican, C. (2005). Muğla üniversitesi eğitim fakültesi ile fenedebiyat fakültesi öğrencilerinin, eğitim fakülteleri ile fenedebiyat fakülteleri hakkındaki karşılaştırmalı görüşleri. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Muğla Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Muğla

Tice, N, T. (1976). Student rights, decisionmaking, and the law. The American Association for Higher Education One Dupont Circle, Suite 780 Washington, D.C. 20036

Topsakal, C. (2003). Avrupa birliği eğitim politikaları ve bu politikalara Türk eğitim sistemi'nin uyumu. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, İstanbul

Türkçapar, Ü. (2007). Beden eğitimi ve spor yüksekokulu öğrencileri ile eğitim fakültesi sınıf öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin strese karşı problem çözme becerilerinin karşılaştırılması. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Ankara.

UNICEF. (2007). Herkes için eğitime insan haklarını temel alan bir yaklaşım. Ankara: Birleşmiş Milletler Eğitim Bilim ve Kültür Örgütü Yayınları.

Varna Teknik Üniversitesi (2011). Varna teknik üniversitesi öğrenci hakları ve yükümlülükleri kılavuzu. http://www.tu-varna.bg/tu-varnatr/images/stories/prava\_i\_zadaljeniq/PRAVIL-NIK\_1.pdf adresinden 15.02.2011 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (1976). *Student rights and responsibilities* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207740).

Wood, C. L., Kelley, K., Test, D., & Fowler, C. (2010). Comparing audio-supported text and explicit instruction on students' knowledge of accommodations, rights, and responsibilities. Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 33 (2), 115-124

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek, H. (2008). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.