

Investigation of Pre-Service Teachers' Tolerance Tendencies and Democratic Tendencies

Canses Tican¹

¹ Faculty of Education, Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Mugla, Turkey

Correspondence: Canses Tican, Faculty of Education, Mugla Sitki Kocman University, Mugla, Turkey. E-mail: ctican@hotmail.com

Received: July 7, 2020

Accepted: September 9, 2020

Online Published: October 9, 2020

doi:10.5539/ies.v13n11p20

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v13n11p20>

Abstract

The current study aims to investigate whether pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on gender and mother and father's education level and the relationship between their tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies. A total of 417 second-year students from the departments of Turkish teaching, social studies teaching, elementary school teacher training, pre-school teacher training, science teaching, elementary school math teaching, arts, music, psychological counselling and guidance, English teaching and German teaching participated in the current study. In the analysis of the collected data, frequencies, percentages, Mann Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis test and correlation analysis were used. As a result of the analyses, the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be very high. The female pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be higher than those of the male pre-service teachers. The pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on mother and father's education level. The pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be higher than the medium level. The female pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be higher than those of the male pre-service teachers. The pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on mother and father's education level. A positive, medium and significant correlation was found between the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies.

Keywords: tolerance, democratic education, democracy, pre-service teacher, democratic tendency

1. Introduction

Tolerance is one of the basic values that enable democratic societies to live together in peace and harmony (Boyacı, 2015). Tolerance is "a functional communication process that is established to understand and accept the feelings, thoughts and behaviours of people we find close or distant to ourselves with unrequited love, respect, trust and understanding" (Büyükkaragöz & Kesici, 1996, p. 353). Tolerance is the acceptance of an idea or behaviour that is not supported. In order for people to live a happy life together, they must tolerate each other's differences and mistakes (Çalışkan & Sağlam, 2012).

Tolerance is stated to be a democratic value (Elkatmış, 2019; Yılmaz, 2011). Tolerance is a pre-requisite of democracy (Tezcan, 2018). Democratic values and democratic society cannot develop in an environment of intolerance (Taneri & Özbek, 2019). There can be no peace without tolerance and no democracy without peace (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 1995). Different emotions and thoughts must be tolerated for democracy to develop in a society (Tahiroğlu, 2014). Democratic life in a classroom environment can be possible by free sharing of emotions and thoughts. Thus, students can develop democratic attitudes towards different approaches and alternative decisions (Aydın, 2008). Today, new generations are wanted to be tolerant and democratic individuals. Therefore, teachers need to be tolerant to their students and create a democratic classroom environment. In this context, it is important to determine the tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies of pre-service teachers, who will be the teachers of future.

1.1 Tolerance

"Tolerance depends on the ability to understand, evaluate and accept other people, regardless of their differences and respecting differences between people and being open-minded" (Kouchok, 2008, p. 404). "Tolerance, respect, acceptance refer to the appreciation of the infinite wealth of our world cultures and they are our ways of

expression and being human. Tolerance is developed with knowledge, openness, communication and freedom of conscience. Tolerance is the harmony of differences” (UNESCO, 1995, p. 9). Heller and Hawkins (1994) defined “tolerance as the capacity to accept and respect other people's beliefs or practices” (p. 344). Hjern, Eger, Bohman, and Connolly (2020) defined tolerance as “a value orientation towards differences” (p. 899).

United Nations (2000) stated that some basic values are necessary for international relations in the 21st century and one of them is tolerance. Tolerance is explained as follows: Humans should respect each other in spite of the differences in their beliefs, cultures and languages. Societies should not oppress and fear the differences within themselves and from other societies rather should glorify them as a valuable asset of humanity. A culture of peace and dialogue among all civilizations should be actively promoted.

The value of tolerance has become more important in recent years with the globalization of the economy, communication, large migrations, urbanization and the change of social order (Ersoy, 2016). Tolerance organizes human and social life and provides an environment that includes love, respect and peace (Mutluer, 2015). Tolerance plays an important role in conducting relationships in the society and ensuring the commitment of individuals to beliefs and values (Yarar Kaptan, 2019).

Tolerant individuals show respect for other people. There are individuals in the world who are not tolerant, othering people who are not like themselves, are violent and do not respect others (Sağlam & Tunar, 2018). The main idea lying at the core of tolerance is to make each individual embrace the values of human dignity and the sanctity of human personality (Kutuev et al., 2016).

Tolerance is an art of living in peace. Expression of different feelings and thoughts freely is a prerequisite for tolerance. But tolerance should not be perceived as ignoring everything and being indifferent to everything. If it is perceived as such, irresponsibility and discipline will occur (Tezcan, 2018).

Tolerance is not inherited. Therefore, education is important in the formation of tolerance. Individuals learn tolerance firstly in their family and then as a result of their interaction with their environment. Individuals' being tolerant is related to the environment in which they live. After the family, the factors that help develop tolerance and turn it into behaviour include school and teachers (Kalm & Naçacı, 2017).

The school and classroom environment, where the child spends most of his/her life after the family, is very important for the development of tolerance. Tolerance-oriented educational and instructional activities to be conducted at school will contribute to the development of tolerance (Boyacı, 2015). In order for the culture of tolerance and coexistence to be successfully delivered in schools, teachers must have sufficient knowledge, skills and qualifications about tolerance education (Kaymakcan, 2007). In order for teachers to treat their students with love and tolerance, they must first recognize and experience tolerance (Tezcan, 2018). The most effective effort to impart tolerance to students at school is to create a tolerant classroom climate. The teacher at school should be tolerant both in academic matters and in communication (Kurtdede Fidan & Güleç, 2016). Students should be informed that behaviours that do not comply with pre-determined ethical, social rules and human rights and democratic rules cannot be tolerated (Kaygısız, 2019).

In the study conducted by Türe and Ersoy (2015), teachers stated that tolerance can be gained through education and teachers should be tolerant. In the study conducted by Utkugün and Yazıcı (2019), pre-service teachers stated that a tolerant teacher should have features such as love, respect, empathy and helpfulness.

Teachers need to be able to internalize tolerance in order for tolerance to be imparted to students at schools. Teachers can create a tolerant and democratic classroom environment if they allow students to say different thoughts, if they listen to their students, empathize with them, and ensure effective participation of students (Kiroğlu, Elma, Kesten, & Egüz, 2012).

The main purpose of education for tolerance is to assist students in developing strategies that will contribute to the creation of a world order that can provide social justice. Therefore, teacher training programs in many countries require multicultural education. Such courses and subjects will enable pre-service teachers to learn concepts such as peace and tolerance better (Şahin, 2011). According to Levina, Lukamonva, Romanovskaya, and Shutova (2015), tolerance can be developed through daily interactive teaching practices that promote empathy and collaboration in an atmosphere of trust and respect.

1.2 Democratic Tendency

The Greek historian Herodot first used the word democracy in the fifth century B.C. It is formed by the combination of the words “demos” which means “people” in Greek and “kratein” which means “power” (Holden, 2007). “Democracy is a functional form of government where the people hold the power, that is, the political power is under the control of people, and principles such as liberty, justice, equality, counselling,

tolerance, exchange of ideas and control come to the fore to ensure this power” (Büyükkaragöz & Kesici, 1998, p. IX). Yılmaz (2006), on the other hand, defines democracy as “a socio-political system in which good and evil, right and wrong can be discussed openly, which even dictators frequently use to be respected by others and which symbolizes the way of governing civilized societies” (p. 15). According to Dewey (2009), “it is more than a form of government; this is basically a way of living together or it is the experiences narrated together” (as cited in Tienken, 2020, p. 64).

Democracy is considered to be both a form of government and a way of life by many scientists, writers and thinkers (Yeşil, 2002). Institutional education plays a very important role in training citizens who need democracy, are sensitive to differences, think critically and creatively, know their rights and freedoms, and are aware of their responsibilities (Tamer, 2011). In a society, education is the driving force for the development and sustainability of democracy culture (Ersoy, 2019). According to Dewey, democracy is synonymous with education. Since democracy is a theory of freedom and tolerance, the education that will lead to democracy should have a democratic structure (Bakır, 2011).

Democracy education “covers all activities carried out to transform the basic values of democracy, such as respect for human rights, equality, participation, tolerance, cooperation, trust, into individuals' behaviours” (Yeşil, 2002, p. 51). In democracy education, democratic principles and values such as pluralism, equality, participation, respect for rights and freedoms, tolerance should be taught to students (Yılmaz & Yıldırım, 2009).

“Democratic education should be taken as the basis in the objectives, policies, programs, regulations, materials, school culture and instructional practices of education by relating the principles and values of democracy to daily life” (Özpolat, 2010, p. 366). “Democratic education is the education in which the principles and rules of democracy, human rights and freedoms are transformed into explicit or implicit goals of educational and instructional programs, and imparted to individuals through learning experiences” (Hotaman, 2010, p. 40). Democratic education focuses on the training of students in such a way as to use democratic principles and processes in the classroom (Collins, Hess, & Lowery, 2019).

The foundation of democratic education is laid in schools. In order for schools to be democratic, two prerequisites must be met: (1) Communication that does not tolerate violence and fosters love, respect and tolerance should be established in school and classroom settings. (2) All elements of the school must participate in decisions made about themselves in school and classroom management (Kepenekçi, 2003). Apple and Beane (2007) state that democratic schools focus on the structures and processes that make students' voices heard and accepted (as cited in Collins et al., 2019). According to İnel (2019), schools can turn into a democratic structure if they practice based on the principles and values of democracy in their decision-making processes, in the relations of school stakeholders (teachers, students, civil servants, other employees of the school, parents, local residents) and in learning-teaching processes.

Teachers should have a democratic attitude first of all in order to develop a democratic understanding in education and create a democratic learning environment (Kozikoğlu, 2017). A teacher with a democratic attitude and behaviour can be an important model for his/her students (Samancı, 2010). In order for students to internalize democratic attitudes and behaviours, the school and classroom atmosphere must be formed in line with democratic values and to be respectful to rights and freedoms (Elkatmış, 2019).

As teachers determine what to teach and how to teach about democracy education, they have an important role in democracy education (Subba, 2014). Democracy is best learned by living in a democratic way. To achieve this, students should be given opportunities to experience democracy as part of their educational process (Tienken, 2020). Through experiential and participatory democratic activities within classes and communities, teachers help their students make sense of their participation and understand how such participation affects the world in which they live (Collins et al., 2019).

Teacher educators should make their pedagogy democratic. Thus, their students can learn the meaning and skills of democratic practice through their educational experience. This requires the creation of the rules of democratic interaction as well as critical inquiry in classes (Subba, 2014).

When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are several studies investigating pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies (Cingi & Çağlar, 2020; Gündüz, 2019; Uca, 2015; Yılmaz & Güven, 2019). There are also some studies investigating pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies (Kozikoğlu, 2017; Taneri & Özbek, 2019; Yılmaz, 2011), democratic values (Akar, İnel, & Yalçıntaş, 2017; Aladağ & Çiftçi, 2017; Çermik, 2013; Köse, Azrak, & Bayır, 2020; Oğuz, 2011; Yazıcı, 2011; Yılmaz, 2011; Zehir Topkaya & Yavuz, 2011), democratic attitudes (Aydemir & Aksoy, 2010; Bektaş & Kılıç, 2011; Eğilmez, Eğilmez, & Engür, 2018; Güven, Kaya, & Aslan, 2014; Gömleksiz & Çetintaş, 2011; Saracaloğlu, Uça, & Baydilek, 2013; Taş, 2018; Toptaş & Elkatmış,

2015; Yiğit & Çolak, 2010). However, there is no study investigating both tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies of pre-service teachers. In this regard, the current study is believed to make contributions to the field.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the current study is to investigate pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies. To this end, answers to the following questions were sought.

- 1) What are the pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies?
- 2) Do the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on gender and mother and father's education level?
- 3) What are the pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies?
- 4) Do the pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on gender and mother and father's education level?
- 5) Is there a significant correlation between the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies?

2. Method

2.1 Research Model

The current study employed the relational survey model. The relational survey model is a research model aiming to determine the presence and degree of co-change between two or more variables (Karasar, 2017).

2.2 Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of the students of the Education Faculty of Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University and the sample is comprised of second-year students selected by using the purposive sampling method, one of the non-random sampling methods. The Tolerance Tendencies Scale and the Democratic Tendencies Scale were administered to a total of 417 second-year students from the departments of Turkish teaching, social studies teaching, elementary school teacher training, pre-school teacher training, science teaching, elementary school math teaching, arts, music, psychological counselling and guidance, English teaching and German teaching. The distribution of the participating teachers across the variables is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Frequency and percentage distribution of the pre-service teachers across the variables

		f	%
Gender	Female	284	68.1
	Male	133	31.9
	Total	417	100.0
Mother's education level	Primary school	194	46.5
	Middle school	89	21.3
	High school	85	20.4
	Associate's degree	9	2.2
	Bachelor's degree	36	8.6
	Graduate degree	4	1.0
	Total	417	100.0
Father's education level	Primary school	108	25.9
	Middle school	102	24.5
	High school	131	31.4
	Associate's degree	17	4.1
	Bachelor's degree	52	12.5
	Graduate degree	7	1.7
	Total	417	100.0

As can be seen in Table 1, 68.1% of the participating pre-service teachers are females and 31.9% of them are males; 46.5% of their mothers are primary school graduates, 21.3% are middle school graduates, 20.4% are high school graduates, 2.2% hold an associate's degree, 8.6% hold a bachelor's degree and 1% hold a graduate degree; 25.9% of their fathers are primary school graduates, 24.5% are middle school graduates, 31.4% are high

school graduates, 4.1% hold an associate's degree, 12.5% hold a bachelor's degree, 1.7% hold a graduate degree.

2.3 Data Collection Tool

The data of the study were collected by using the Tolerance Tendencies Scale, Democratic Tendencies Scale and a personal information form.

2.3.1 Personal Information Form

This personal information form was developed by the researcher to elicit information about the participants' gender and mother and father's education level.

2.3.2 Tolerance Tendencies Scale

In the current study, the Tolerance Tendencies Scale developed by Gül and Alimbekov (2018) was used. The scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions called empathy, importance, compliance and attitude and a total of 15 items. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was calculated to be 0.86. In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha's reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.80. The lowest score to be taken from the scale is 15 while the highest score is 75. A score taken from the scale in the range of 62–75 means Tolerant at a Very High Level, in the range of 49–61 means Tolerant at a High Level, in the range of 48–60 means Tolerant at a Medium Level, in the range of 15–47 means Tolerant at a Low Level.

2.3.3 Democratic Tendencies Scale

In the current study, the Democratic Tendencies Scale developed by Akbaşlı et al. (2010) was used. The scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions called democratic teacher, democracy towards students, classroom management and freedom of expression and 18 items. The Cronbach Alpha's reliability coefficient was calculated to be 0.74 for the whole scale. In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha's reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0.85. The highest score to be taken from the scale is 90 and the lowest score is 18.

2.4 Data Analysis

The quantitative data collected with the Tolerance Tendencies Scale and the Democratic Tendencies Scale were analyzed by using the SPSS 22 program package. First, it was checked whether the data distributed normally to determine which statistical tests to be used.

If the distribution of the data is normal, then parametric tests are used and if the distribution is not normal, then non-parametric tests are used in the analysis (Taşpınar, 2007). As a result of the normality analyses, significance levels of the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test ($p < 0.05$) were checked. As these data did not show a normal distribution, non-parametric tests were used. In the analysis of the collected data, frequencies, percentages, Mann Whitney U test, Kruskal Wallis test and correlation analysis were used.

3. Findings

In this section, the findings of the current study are presented within the context of the sub-problems.

3.1 Findings Related to the Pre-Service Teachers' Tolerance Tendencies and Whether These Tendencies Vary Significantly Depending on Some Variables

Table 2. Pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies

	N	\bar{X}	SD
Tolerance Tendencies (Total)	417	66.88	5.86

The Tolerance Tendencies Scale is a five-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". The highest score to be taken from this 15-item scale is 75 while the lowest score is 15. In the current study, the mean score taken from the whole scale by the pre-service teachers was found to be 66.88. This shows that the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies are at a very high level ($\bar{X}=66.88$; SD: 5.86). The findings related to whether the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on gender are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Mann Whitney U test conducted to determine whether the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on gender

Dimension	Gender	N	Median	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	M.W.U	p
Tolerance Tendencies (Total)	Female	284	69.00	223.07	63350.50	14891.500	.000
	Male	133	67.00	178.97	23802.50		

* $p < 0.05$.

As can be seen in Table 3, the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on gender. The female pre-service teachers have higher tolerance tendency scores ($SO=223.07$; $Median=69.00$) than those of the male pre-service teachers ($SO=178.97$; $Median=67.00$). The findings related to whether the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on mother's education level are given in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of Kruskal Wallis test conducted to determine whether the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on mother's education level

Dimension	Mother's education level	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X^2	p
Tolerance Tendencies (Total)	Primary school	194	209.45	5	2.648	.754
	Middle school	89	212.02			
	High school	85	217.88			
	Associate's degree	9	208.00			
	Bachelor's degree	36	180.47			
	Graduate degree	4	190.25			

* $p < 0.05$.

As can be seen in Table 4, the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies do not vary significantly depending on mother's education level ($p > .05$). The pre-service teachers' levels of tolerance tendencies are close to each other ($SO_{Primary}=209.45$; $SO_{Middle}=212.02$; $SO_{High}=217.88$; $SO_{Associate's}=208.00$; $SO_{Bachelor's}=180.47$; $SO_{Graduate}=190.25$). The findings related to whether the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on mother's education level are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of Kruskal Wallis test conducted to determine whether the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies vary significantly depending on father's education level

Dimension	Father's education level	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X^2	p
Tolerance Tendencies (Total)	Primary school	108	196.43	5	3.162	.675
	Middle school	102	214.73			
	High school	131	216.73			
	Associate's degree	17	217.50			
	Bachelor's degree	52	208.11			
	Graduate degree	7	160.93			

* $p < 0.05$.

As can be seen in Table 5, the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies do not vary significantly depending on father's education level ($p > .05$). The pre-service teachers' levels of tolerance tendencies are close to each other ($SO_{Primary}=196.43$; $SO_{Middle}=214.73$; $SO_{High}=216.73$; $SO_{Associate's}=217.50$; $SO_{Bachelor's}=208.11$; $SO_{Graduate}=160.93$).

3.2 Findings Related to the Pre-Service Teachers' Democratic Tendencies and Whether These Tendencies Vary Significantly Depending on Some Variables

Table 6. Pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies

	N	\bar{X}	SD
Democratic Tendencies (Total)	417	75.18	8.53

The Democratic Tendencies Scale is a five-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”. The highest score to be taken from this 18-item scale is 90 while the lowest score is 18. The median for the scores taken from this scale was set to be 54. In the current study, the median found for the scores taken from the scale by the pre-service teachers is 75.18. Thus, it can be said that the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies are over the medium ($\bar{X}=75.18$; SD: 8.53). Findings related to whether the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on gender are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Results of Mann Whitney U test conducted to determine whether the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on gender

Dimension	Gender	N	Median	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	M.W.U	p
Democratic tendencies (Total)	Female	284	77.00	218.65	62096.00	16146.000	.017
	Male	133	75.00	188.40	25057.00		

* $p < 0.05$.

As can be seen in Table 7, the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on gender. The female pre-service teachers were found to have higher democratic tendency scores (SO=218.65; Median=77.00) than those of the male pre-service teachers (SO=188.40; Median=75.00). Findings related to whether the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on mother’s education level are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Results of Kruskal Wallis test conducted to determine whether the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on mother’s education level

Dimension	Mother’s education level	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p
Democratic tendencies (Total)	Primary school	194	224.38	5	8.567	.128
	Middle school	89	200.41			
	High school	85	202.32			
	Associate’s degree	9	203.06			
	Bachelor’s degree	36	165.83			
	Graduate degree	4	198.00			

* $p < 0.05$.

As can be seen in Table 8, the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies do not vary significantly depending on mother’s education level ($p > .05$). The pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies are close to each other (SO_{Primary}=224.38; SO_{Middle}=200.41; SO_{High}=202.32; SO_{Associate’s}=203.06; SO_{Bachelor’s}=165.83; SO_{Graduate}=198.00). Findings related to whether the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on father’s education level are given in Table 9.

Table 9. Results of Kruskal Wallis test conducted to determine whether the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies vary significantly depending on father’s education level

Dimension	Father’s education level	N	Mean Rank	Sd	X ²	p
Democratic tendencies (Total)	Primary school	108	204.65	5	6.565	.255
	Middle school	102	210.00			
	High school	131	220.42			
	Associate’s degree	7	188.32			
	Bachelor’s degree	52	207.39			
	Graduate degree	7	110.07			

* $p < 0.05$.

As can be seen in Table 9, the pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies do not vary significantly depending on father’s education level ($p > .05$). The pre-service teachers’ democratic tendencies are close to each other (SO_{Primary}=204.65; SO_{Middle}=210.00; SO_{High}=220.42; SO_{Associate’s}=188.32; SO_{Bachelor’s}=207.39; SO_{Graduate}=110.07).

3.3 Findings Related to Correlation Between the Pre-Service Teachers' Tolerance Tendencies and Democratic Tendencies

Table 10. Correlation between the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies

	Democratic tendencies
Tolerance tendencies	$r=0.56^{**}$

* $p<0.05$.

As can be seen in Table 10, there is a medium, positive and significant correlation between tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies ($r=0.56$; $p<0.05$).

4. Discussion

In the current study, it was aimed to determine the relationships between tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies. The pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be at a very high level. Gündüz (2019) also found that the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies are close to high. In the study conducted by Uca (2015), the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be at a very high level. Gül and Alimbekov (2020) and Yılmaz and Güven (2019) determined that the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies are high. In their study on university students, Szejnberg and Jasiński (2014) found that 86% of the students' level of tolerance is medium. These findings concur with the finding of the current study. In the current study, the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be very high and this may indicate that they will treat their students in a tolerant manner and can teach students how to be tolerant.

When the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were examined in relation to gender, the female pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be higher than those of the male pre-service teachers. In the study conducted by Gündüz (2019), it was also found that the female pre-service teachers tend to be more tolerant than the male pre-service teachers. In their study, Büyükkaragöz and Kesici (1998) found that the teachers' tolerance and democracy attitudes vary significantly by gender in favour of the female teachers. Muhammed (2019) determined that the tolerance score of the female teachers is slightly higher than that of the male teachers. In their study conducted on university students, Szejnberg and Jasiński (2014) concluded that the female students are more tolerant than the male students. In the studies conducted by Aslan (2017) and Sağlam and Tunar (2018), a significant difference was found in the tolerance tendencies of primary school students in favour of the female students. In the studies conducted by Bektaş-Öztaşkın and İçen (2015); Çalışkan, Yıldırım, and Kılınç (2019); Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012); Kalın and Nalçacı (2017) on middle school students, the tolerance tendencies of the female students were found to be higher than those of the male students. These findings reported in the literature concur with the finding of the current study.

In their study, Gül and Alimbekov (2020) found that the tolerance tendencies of the male pre-service teachers are higher than those of the female pre-service teachers. In the studies conducted by Uca (2015) and Yılmaz and Güven (2019), the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on gender. In their study, İnel and Gökalp (2018) also found that middle school students' tolerance tendencies do not vary significantly depending on gender. The findings of these studies do not support the finding of the current study. The finding obtained in the current study showing that the female pre-service teachers are more tolerant than the male pre-service teachers might be because of the personality characteristics of women such as their being more emotional, sensitive and understanding.

The pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on mother's education level. In their studies, Cingi and Çağlar (2020) and Uca (2015) found that the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies do not vary depending on mother's education level. İnel and Gökalp (2018) also reported that middle school students' tolerance tendencies do not vary depending on mother's education level. These findings support the finding of the current study. In their study conducted on middle school students, Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012) found that with increasing level of mother's education, the students' tolerance tendencies also increased. In their study conducted on middle school students, Kalın and Nalçacı (2017) found that the students' tolerance tendencies were positively affected by increasing level of mother's education. The findings reported by these studies do not concur with the finding of the current study. In the current study, the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on mother's education level and this shows that mother's education level does not cause any significant difference in pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies.

The pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on father's education level. In their studies, Cingi and Çağlar (2020) and Uca (2015) also found that the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies do not vary significantly depending on father's education level. Çalışkan and Sağlam (2012) and İnel and Gökalp (2018) also found that the middle school students' tolerance tendencies do not vary significantly depending on father's education level. These findings reported in the literature support the current study. In their study conducted on middle school students, Kalın and Nalçacı (2017) found that father's education level positively affects students' tolerance tendencies. This finding conflicts with the finding of the current study. In the current study, the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on father's education level and this shows that father's education level does not cause any significant difference in pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies.

The pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be higher than the medium level. In their studies, Çermik (2013); Köse et al. (2020); Oğuz (2011); Yazıcı (2011); Yılmaz (2011); Zehir Topkaya and Yavuz (2011) found that the pre-service teachers' democratic values are high. Kozikoğlu (2017) also reported that the pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies are high. In the study conducted by Akar et al. (2017), the pre-service teachers' democratic values were found to be at the medium level. The findings of these studies support the current study. In the current study, the pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be higher than medium; thus, it can be said that they see themselves as democratic individuals.

The female pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be higher than those of the male students. In their study, Taneri and Özbek (2019) found that the female pre-service teachers exhibit more democratic tendencies than the male pre-service teachers. Köse et al. (2020) also reported that the female pre-service teachers have higher democratic values. In their studies, Aydemir and Aksoy (2010); Gömleksiz and Çetintaş (2011) and Yiğit and Çolak (2010), the pre-service teachers' democratic attitudes were found to be varying significantly depending on gender in favour of the female pre-service teachers. These findings reported in the literature support the current study.

In the study conducted by Çermik (2013), the male pre-service teachers' democratic values were found to be higher than those of the female pre-service teachers. In their study, Bektaş and Kılıç (2011), Chandrakar and Kumar (2016), Eğilmez et al. (2018), Güven et al. (2014), Saracaloğlu et al. (2013), Taş (2018), and Toptaş and Elkatmış (2015) found that pre-service teachers' democratic attitudes do not vary significantly depending on gender. Similarly, Aladağ and Çiftçi (2017), Akar et al. (2017), Oğuz (2011), Yazıcı (2011), and Zehir Topkaya and Yavuz (2011) concluded that pre-service teachers' democratic values do not vary significantly depending on gender. In the study conducted by Kozikoğlu (2017), the pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on gender. The finding of this study does not concur with the finding of the current study. In the current study, the female pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be higher than those of the male students and this might be because of their higher tolerance tendencies.

The pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on mother's education level. Similarly, Yazıcı (2011) concluded that pre-service teachers' democratic values do not vary significantly depending on mother's education level. In the studies conducted by Aydemir and Aksoy (2010), Eğilmez et al. (2018), Güven et al. (2014), Toptaş and Elkatmış (2015), the pre-service teachers' democratic attitudes were found to be not varying significantly depending on mother's education level. The findings of these studies are parallel to the finding of the current study.

In the study conducted by Gömleksiz and Çetintaş (2011), it was found that the democratic attitudes of the pre-service teachers whose mothers are illiterate were found to be higher than those of the students whose mothers are primary, middle, high school and university graduates. Yiğit and Çolak (2010) found that the democratic attitudes of the pre-service teachers whose mothers are high school graduates are higher than those of the pre-service teachers whose mothers are primary school graduates. The findings of these studies do not support the current study. In the current study, no significant difference based on mother's education level was found. Thus, it can be argued that mother's education level does not cause a significant difference in pre-service teachers' democratic attitudes.

The pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies were found to be not varying significantly depending on father's education level. In the studies conducted by Aydemir and Aksoy (2010); Eğilmez et al. (2018); Güven et al. (2014); Gömleksiz and Çetintaş (2011); Toptaş and Elkatmış (2015), the pre-service teachers' democratic attitudes were found to be not varying significantly depending on father's education level. These studies support the current study. In their study, Yiğit and Çolak (2010) found that the democratic attitudes of the pre-service teachers whose fathers are high school graduates are higher than those of the pre-service teachers whose fathers

are primary school graduates. The finding of this study does not support the current study. In the current study, no significant difference based on father's education level was found. Thus, it can be argued that father's education level does not create any significant difference in pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies.

A medium, positive and significant correlation was found between the pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies and democratic tendencies. In their study, Bektaş-Öztaşkın and İçen (2015) found a positive and significant correlation between the middle school students' tolerance tendencies and democracy perceptions. This finding is in compliance with the finding of the current study. Thus, it can be argued that with pre-service teachers' increasing tolerance tendencies, their democratic tendencies can increase.

In light of the findings of the current study, following suggestions can be made: When the literature is reviewed, it is seen that there are just few studies investigating pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies. Therefore, future studies can investigate pre-service teachers' tolerance tendencies in relation to some variables such as grade level and department. Learning and teaching activities directed to the development of tolerance and democracy tendencies of pre-service teachers can be incorporated into teacher training programs. Experimental studies can be conducted to develop pre-service teachers' tolerance and democratic tendencies. Supportive learning-teaching activities can be organized to develop male students' tolerance and democratic tendencies. Pre-service teachers can be encouraged to prepare projects to develop their tolerance and democratic tendencies in project-preparation classes.

References

- Akar, C., İnel, Y., & Yalçıntaş, E. (2017). Research of levels of democratic values of classroom teacher candidates on various variables. *Journal of Current Researches on Educational Studies*, 7(2), 41-58.
- Akbaşlı, S., Yanpar Yelken, T., & Sünbül, Ö. (2010). Study on the development of scale of democratic tendencies for pre-service teachers. *International Eurasia Social Sciences Journal*, 1(1), 94-108.
- Aladağ, S., & Çiftci, S. (2017). An investigation of the relationship between digital citizenship levels of preservice primary school teachers and their democratic values. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(6), 171-184. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v11n1p111>
- Aslan, S. (2017). An analysis of the tendency to tolerance and helpfulness attitude of 4th grade students in terms of certain variable. *İnönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 18(1), 163-175.
- Aydemir, H., & Aksoy, N. D. (2010). Investigation of democratic attitudes of education faculty students in relation to some variables: Case of Malatya. *Erzincan University Education Faculty Journal*, 12(1), 265-279.
- Aydın, A. (2008). *Classroom management*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Bakır, K. (2011). *Democratic education, the education philosophy of John Dewey* (1st ed.). Ankara: Pegem.
- Bektas, F., & Kilic, D. (2011). Relationship between school culture perceived by teacher candidates and their democratic attitudes. *The New Educational Review*, 25(3), 128-138.
- Bektaş-Öztaşkın, Ö., & İçen, M. (2015). Examination of the relation between tendencies to tolerance and perceptions of democracy of secondary school students. *The Black Sea Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(1), 39-56.
- Boyacı, M. (2015). *Effectiveness of the education program to develop tolerance tendencies: Development of tolerance tendencies and prevention of bullying* (Unpublished doctoral thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Büyükkaragöz, S., & Kesici, Ş. (1996). Teachers' tolerance and democratic attitudes. *Education Management*, 2(3), 353-365.
- Büyükkaragöz, S., & Kesici, Ş. (1998). *Democracy and human rights education*. Ankara: Turkish Democracy Foundation.
- Çalışkan, H., & Sağlam, H. İ. (2012). A study on the development of the tendency to tolerance scale and an analysis of the tendencies of primary school students to tolerance through certain variables. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 12(2), 1431-1446.
- Çalışkan, H., Yıldırım, Y., & Kılınc, G. (2019). Examination of the responsibility and tolerance of students raised in families with different cultural structures. *Education and Science*, 44(199), 353-372. <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2019.7986>

- Çermik, H. (2013). Pre-service teachers' democratic values and investigation of these values based on some variables. *NWSA: Education Sciences*, 8(2), 261-274. <https://doi.org/10.12739/NWSA.2013.8.2.1C0586>
- Chandrakar, M., & Kumar, K. (2016). A study of political interest and democratic attitude of prospective teachers of Chhattisgarh. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(4), 70-76.
- Cingi, M., & Çağlar, A. (2020). Investigation of preschool teacher candidates' tolerance levels in terms of various variables. *Social Scientific Centered Issues*, 2(1), 15-23.
- Collins, J., Hess, M. E., & Lowery, C. L. (2019). Democratic spaces: How teachers establish and sustain democracy and education in their classrooms. *Democracy and Education*, 27(1), 1-12.
- Eğilmez, H. O., Eğilmez, Ö., & Engür, D. (2018). Democratic perception and attitudes of pre-service music teachers in Turkey. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 7(2), 100-108. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v7i2.13141>
- Elkatmış, M. (2019). Values education with its different aspects. In R. Turan, & K. Ulusoy (Eds.), *Place of democracy in school culture* (pp. 42-76). Ankara: Pegem.
- Elkatmış, M., & Toptaş, V. (2015). Exploration of prospective classroom teachers' democratic attitudes. *YYU Journal of Education Faculty*, 12(1), 128-144.
- Ersoy, A. F. (2016). Experiences and perceptions of four-grade students on tolerance: A phenomenological research. *Mersin University Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 12(1), 454-473.
- Ersoy, A. F. (2019). Democracy and human rights education is social studies classes. In R. Turan (Ed.), *Human rights and democracy education* (pp. 225-247). Ankara: Pegem.
- Gömleksiz, M. N., & Çetintaş, S. (2011). Democratic attitudes of pre-service teachers. *Dicle University Ziya Gökalp Education Faculty Journal*, 17, 1-14.
- Gül, Y. E., & Alimbekov, A. (2018). Teacher candidates tolerance scale: Validity and reliability. *MANAS Journal of Social Studies*, 7(4), 77-87.
- Gül, Y. E., & Alimbekov, A. (2020). Investigation of teachers candidates' tolerance and life satisfaction levels. *Turkish Studies-Educational Sciences*, 15(2), 831-849. <https://doi.org/10.29228/TurkishStudies.39864>
- Gündüz, M. (2019). Determination of tolerance levels of teacher candidates. *SDU International Journal of Educational Studies*, 6(2), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.33710/sduijes.606172>
- Güven, A., Kaya, R., & Aslan, H. (2014). An examination of pre-service history teachers' democratic attitudes with regard to different variables. *Middle Eastern & African Journal of Educational Research*, 12, 17-30.
- Heller, C., & Hawkins, J. (1994). Teaching tolerance: Notes from the front line. *Teachers College Record*, 95(3), 337-368.
- Hjerm, M., Eger, M. A., Bohman, A., & Connolly, F. F. (2020). A new approach to the study of tolerance: Conceptualizing and measuring acceptance, respect, and appreciation of difference. *Social Indicators Research*, 147, 897-919. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02176-y>
- Holden, B. (2007). *Understanding liberal democracy* (Trans. H. Bal). Ankara: Liberte.
- Hotaman, D. (2010). Democratic education: A democratic education program. *Theoretical Educational Science*, 3(1), 29-42.
- İnel, Y. (2019). Democratic life. In İ. Acun (Ed.), *Human rights and democracy education* (pp. 85-100). Ankara: Pegem.
- İnel, Y., & Gökalp, A. (2018). Investigation of tolerance trends of secondary school students. *Turkish Studies-Educational Sciences*, 13(27), 847-877. <https://doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.14380>
- Kalm, Z. T., & Nalçacı, A. (2017). Examination of tendencies towards tolerance among 5th year secondary school students on the basis of different variances. *Journal of Bayburt Education Faculty*, 12(23), 293-304.
- Karasar, N. (2017). *Scientific research methods: Concepts, principles, techniques*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Kaygısız, İ. (2019). Investigation of tolerance perceptions of fourth grade elementary school students through pictures. *International Journal of Scholars in Education*, 2(2), 75-92.
- Kaymakcan, R. (2007). Tolerance as a value and education. *Values Education Centre Journal*, 2(6), 114-119.
- Kepenekçi, Y. K. (2003). Democratic school. *Educational Research*, 3(11), 44-53.

- Kıroğlu, K., Elma, C., Kesten, A., & Egüz, Ş. (2012). Tolerance as a democratic value in higher education. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 3(2), 86-104.
- Köse, T. Ç., Azrak, Y., & Bayır, Ö. G. (2020). Examination of the relationship between preservice social studies teachers' democratic values and attitudes towards today's world problems. *Elementary Education Online*, 19(2), 477-490. <https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2020.689680>
- Kouchok, K. H. (2008). What should be done and should not be done to teach tolerance to children: Some reflections from the case of Egypt (Trans. Cemil Oruç). *Fırat University Faculty of Theology Journal*, 13(2), 403-412.
- Kozikoğlu, İ. (2017). Analyzing the relationship between prospective teachers' democratic tendencies and their respect for differences levels. *International Journal of Advanced Education and Research*, 2(6), 19-29.
- Kurtdede Fidan, N., & Güleç, F. (2016). "Tolerance value" from the perspectives of pre-service classroom teachers. *Dicle University Journal of Ziya Gökalp Faculty of Education*, 28, 246-258. <https://doi.org/10.14582/DUZGEF.726>
- Kutuev, R. A., Katicheva, M. G., Rassolov, I. M., Derdizova, F. V., Yevgrafova, O. G., & Koganov, I. V. (2016). Practical recommendations on students' tolerance behaviour formation in the university. *International Journal of the Environmental and Science Education*, 11(17), 10365-10376.
- Levina, L., Lukamonva, O., Romanovskaya, L., & Shutova, T. (2015). Teaching tolerance in the English language classroom. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 236, 277-282. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.12.029>
- Muhammed, H. İ. (2019). *Development of tolerance scale: A study of validity and reliability* (Unpublished master thesis). Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Van, Türkiye.
- Mutluer, C. (2015). Metaphorical perceptions of social sciences teacher candidates on concept of "tolerance". *Journal of History School*, 8(22), 575-595. <https://doi.org/10.14225/Joh735>
- Oğuz, A. (2011). Pre-service teachers' democratic values and teaching and learning conceptions. *Values Education Journal*, 9(22), 139-160.
- Özpolat, A. (2010). Reflection of democracy into education as a paradigm of social change: Democratic education. *Ministry of National Education Journal*, 185, 365-381.
- Sağlam, H. İ., & Tunar, T. (2018). Examining the relationship between caring for family unity and levels of tolerance tendencies of primary school students. *Education and Science*, 43(95), 119-136. <https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2018.7432>
- Şahin, Ç. (2011). Perceptions of prospective teachers about tolerance. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(1), 77-86.
- Samancı, O. (2010). Democracy education in elementary schools. *The Social Studies*, 101(1), 30-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00377990903285499>
- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Uça, S., Baydilek, N. B., & Coşkun, N. (2013). Investigation of pre-service teachers' democratic attitudes and value perceptions. *Adnan Menderes University Education Faculty Educational Sciences Journal*, 4(1), 45-59.
- Subba, D. (2014). Democratic values and democratic approach in teaching: A perspective. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(12A), 37-40. <https://doi.org/10.12691/education-2-12A-6>
- Sztejnberg, A., & Jasiński, T. L. (2014). Measurement of the tolerance general level in the higher education students. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 1(4), 01-07.
- Tahiroğlu, M. (2014). A tolerant and democratic classroom society implementation. *International Journal of Eurasia Social Sciences*, 5(17), 87-110.
- Tamer, M. G. (2011). Transforming of schools to democratic and participative learning environment. *Ministry of National Education Journal*, 192, 7-25.
- Taneri, P. O., & Özbek, Ö. Y. (2019). *What is the teacher is not democratic in the classroom! A study on pre-service teachers' democratic tendencies*. ULEAD 2019 Annual Congress: ICRE (pp. 125-134).
- Taş, A. M. (2018). Examination of the relationship between the democratic attitude of prospective teachers and their communication skills. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(5), 1060-1068. <https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.060527>

- Taşpınar, M. (2017). *SPSS applied quantitative data analysis in social sciences*. Ankara: Pegem.
- Tezcan, M. (2018). *Values education sociological approach*. Ankara: Ani.
- Tienken, C. H. (2020). Democratic education: What would Dewey say? *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 56(1), 35-41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2020.1696093>
- Türe, H., & Ersoy, A. F. (2015). Social studies teachers' perceptions of tolerance education and tolerance education practices. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 5(1), 57-87.
- Uca, M. A. (2015). *Relationship between education faculty students' attitudes towards the profession of teaching and their levels of possessing the value of tolerance* (Unpublished master's thesis). Van Yüzüncü Yıl University, Van, Turkey.
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of principles on tolerance*. Retrieved April 30, 2020, from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.phpURL_ID=13175&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html
- United Nations. (2000). *Millennium declaration*. Retrieved April 15, 2020, from <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/Millennium.aspx>
- Utkugün, C., & Yazıcı, S. (2019). The teacher candidates approach to the value of tolerance. *ETU Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 9, 17-31.
- Yarar Kaptan, S. (2019). The effect of mixed approach based computer aided activities on the attitudes of primary school 4th grade students towards tolerance value. *GUJGEF*, 39(2), 1087-1111. <https://doi.org/10.17152/gefad.446841>
- Yazıcı, K. (2011). An analysis of social studies prospective teachers' democratic values in relation to various variables. *Education and Science*, 36(159), 165-178.
- Yeşil, R. (2002). *Human rights and democracy education in school and family* (1st ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Yiğit, E. Ö., & Çolak, K. (2010). Democratic attitudes of social studies pre-service teachers. *Educational Research Association the International Journal of Research in Teacher Education*, 1(Special Issue), 82-95.
- Yılman, M. (2006). *Cultural foundations of our democracy* (10th ed.). Ankara: Nobel.
- Yılmaz, H., & Güven, Y. (2019). Creativity and tolerance: A research on preschool teacher candidates. *Journal of Early Childhood Studies*, 3(2), 258-277. <https://doi.org/10.24130/eccd-jecs.1967201932165>
- Yılmaz, K. (2011). Relationship between pre-service teachers' opinions about democratic values and student control ideologies. *Uludağ University Education Faculty Journal*, 24(2), 297-315.
- Yılmaz, K., & Yıldırım, G. (2009). Teacher and student opinions about democracy education and the implementation of the project of school councils. *M.Ü. Atatürk Education Faculty Educational Sciences Journal*, 29, 187-207.
- Zehir Topkaya, E., & Yavuz, A. (2011). Democratic values and teacher self-efficacy perceptions: A case of pre-service English language teachers in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(8), 32-49. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2011v36n8.1>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).