

The Attitude of Discussion as an Indicator of Democracy: An Intellectual Challenge in the Context of Education

Fatih Öztürk¹ İsmail Karsantık²

To cite this article:

Öztürk, F. & Karsantık, İ. (2022). The attitude of discussion as an indicator of democracy: An intellectual challenge in the context of education. *e- Kafkas Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9, 1171-1192. doi: 10.30900/kafkasegt.1081624

Research article

Received: 02.03.2022

Accepted: 28.12.2022

Abstract

Discussion is both a democratic civic skill and a teaching method. It has been observed that social studies stakeholders are generally kept their distance toward discussion. It has been observed that there are few studies carried out on the discussion attitudes of teacher candidates (TCs) in the context of social studies. It is observed that TCs have both positive and negative attitudes toward discussion. On the other hand, the number of studies examining secondary school students' attitudes toward the discussion is limited. The current study aims to examine the attitudes of three participant groups (student, teacher, and TCs) toward the discussion. The survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods, was used. The sample of the study consisted of 269 students, 617 TCs, and 167 teachers, a total of 1053 participants, determined by the convenience sampling method. In order to collect data, the argumentative attitude scale developed by Infante and Rancer (1982) as 20 items and adapted into Turkish as ten items by Turunç, Eser, and Dinç (2018), and a personal information form developed by the researchers was used. Frequency and percentage distributions regarding the demographic characteristics of students, TCs, and teachers, as well as the argumentative attitudes of the participants, were determined according to the independent variables. According to the findings, teachers' discussion attitudes did not differ significantly by experience and gender. A significant difference was found between the grade levels of TCs and secondary school students. Also, it was observed that male TCs had a higher avoidance attitude. The research showed that although teachers, students, and TCs had positive attitudes, they also had various concerns about the discussion. In light of the results, the participation of teachers, students, and TCs in carefully prepared and conducted discussions and the examination of conflicting emotions with longitudinal studies was suggested.

Keywords: Discussion, attitude, democracy, participation, social studies teaching.

¹  Corresponding Author, Assistant Professor, fatih.ozturk@erdogan.edu.tr, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, Faculty of Education, Turkey

²  Author, Associate Professor, ismail.karsantik@erdogan.edu.tr, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, Faculty of Education, Turkey

Demokrasinin Göstergesi Olarak Tartışmacı Tutum: Eğitim Bağlamında Bir Fikirsel Meydan Okuma Yolu

Fatih Öztürk¹

İsmail Karsantık²

Atıf:

Öztürk, F. & Karsantık, İ. (2022). The attitude of discussion as an indicator of democracy: An intellectual challenge in the context of education. *e- Kafkas Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9, 1171-1192. doi: 10.30900/kafkasegt. 1081624

Araştırma Makalesi

Geliş Tarihi: 02.03.2022

Kabul Tarihi: 28.12.2022

Öz

Tartışma hem demokratik vatandaşlık becerisi ve bir öğretim yöntemidir. Sosyal bilgiler paydaşlarının tartışmaya genellikle mesafeli oldukları gözlenmiştir. İlgili araştırmalar incelendiğinde öğretmen adaylarının sosyal bilgiler bağlamında tartışma tutumlarını inceleyen çalışmalar olduğu gözlenmiştir. Öğretmen adaylarının tartışmaya yönelik olumlu ve olumsuz tutumlara sahip olduğu gözlenmektedir. Öte yandan ortaokul düzeyinde öğrencilerin tartışmaya yönelik tutumlarını inceleyen çalışma sayısı sınırlıdır. Bu araştırma, üç katılımcı grubunun (öğrenci, öğretmen ve öğretmen adayı) tartışmaya yönelik tutumlarını incelemeyi hedeflemektedir. Araştırmada ortaöğretim düzeyindeki öğrencilerin, öğretmenlerin ve öğretmen adaylarının tartışmaya yönelik tutumlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi ve gruplar arasındaki farklılığın ortaya konulması amaçlandığından nicel araştırma yöntemlerinden tarama modeli kullanılmıştır. Araştırmanın örneklemini ise kolay ulaşılabilir örneklem yöntemi ile belirlenen 269 öğrenci, 617 öğretmen adayı ve 167 öğretmen, toplam 1053 katılımcı oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada veri toplamak üzere Infante ve Rancer (1982) tarafından 20 madde olarak geliştirilen, Turunç, Eser ve Dinç (2018) tarafından 10 madde halinde Türkçe'ye uyarlanan tartışmacı tutum ölçeği ile araştırmacılar tarafından geliştirilen kişisel bilgi formu kullanılmıştır. Öğrencilerin, öğretmen adaylarının ve öğretmenlerin demografik özelliklerine ilişkin frekans ve yüzde dağılımlarının yanı sıra katılımcıların tartışmacı tutumları bağımsız değişkenlere göre belirlenmiştir. Öğretmenlerin tutumları kıdem ve cinsiyete göre anlamlı farklılık göstermemektedir. Öğretmen adaylarının ve ortaokul öğrencilerinin sınıf düzeyleri arasında anlamlı farklılık bulunmuştur. Yine öğretmen adaylarında erkeklerin kaçınma tutumuna daha çok sahip olduğu gözlenmiştir. Araştırma öğretmen, öğrenci ve öğretmen adaylarının tartışmacılığa yönelik olumlu tutumlara sahip olsa da tartışmayla ilgili çeşitli kaygılarının da olduğunu göstermektedir. Sonuçlar ışığında öğretmen, öğrenci ve öğretmen adaylarının özenle hazırlanmış ve yürütülen tartışmalara katılımının sağlanması ile çelişen duyguların boylamsal araştırmalarla incelenmesi önerilmiştir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Tartışma, tutum, demokrasi, katılım, sosyal bilgiler öğretimi.

¹  Sorumlu Yazar, Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, fatih.ozturk@erdogan.edu.tr Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, Faculty of Education, Turkey

²  Yazar, Doç. Dr., ismail.karsantik@erdogan.edu.tr, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi, Faculty of Education, Turkey

Introduction

Democracy is both a political system and a way of life (Dewey, 2004). Democracy is basically a political system that provides constitutional rights to change politicians via elections and a social mechanism that allows people to influence important decisions by choosing decision-makers (Dahl, 2010). The importance of democracy for an equal, fair, and human rights-based system has been widely recognized. However, a report published in the last months of 2021 states that democracy is on the decline in the world. It was stated that "the number of countries experiencing democratic decline has never been higher" (URL-1). However, this is not the only document that informs the fragility of democracy. Habermas drew attention to the representation crisis that emerged in western societies decades before the report (Held & Simon, 2006).

Habermas argued that developed and advanced capitalist countries have to face a system crisis that starts from the economic system and moves to the political and cultural areas (David & Larry, 2006). By the 1990s, the system crisis had turned into a legitimacy crisis that democratic institutions were dealing with. Therefore, according to Habermas, democratic countries face several dangers. To name some, citizens as democratic subjects lose their power of determining and influencing. Moreover, the decisions taken by politicians lose their legitimacy since the elections lose their representative features. Habermas thinks that the "legitimacy problem of the system" can be resolved through negotiations, which are the product of the communication of citizens whose rights are guaranteed. This view is the main argument of the discursive model developed by Habermas. The basic pillars of the model are; (a) citizenship, (b) rights, and (c) participation. According to the model, every citizen affected by a decision has the right to participate equally in the discussion about that decision (Altınkök, 2015). Therefore, it is the right of every participating citizen to ask questions, put forward a new argument/claim, and express individual-social behavior, desires, or wishes. So each citizen participating in the debate has the right to oppose an argument/claim. Therefore, debaters or citizens should not encounter any internal (spiritual) or external (physical) barriers while debating.

Theoretical Background

The consensus, which is based on rational, free speech, plays a vital role in sustaining and strengthening democracy. It is understood that democracy is not an easy and simple system to implement or a self-sustaining system. On the contrary, democracy is also realized in a social environment where diverse opinions emerge, opponents are open to each others' views, and interest groups challenge one another peacefully. It is understood that a discussion is an important tool for the representation of citizens. Therefore, sustaining and strengthening democracy will require certain habits of mind (Sheppard, Ashcraft, & Larson, 2011). Sustaining and strengthening habits of mind for a democratic discussion is an important task of educational institutions.

Educational institutions present a suitable setting for the task because the school can be seen as a sample of society (Parker, 2010). Although there are exceptions, in an average class, there are students from diverse socioeconomic levels, gender, culture, ethnic group, belief, and worldviews. It is an important civic skill for students to learn how to discuss an issue regarding their daily and future lives. Because it is important how students or individuals will express and discuss their thoughts in a democratic society, therefore, it can be said that being able to discuss is an important civic skill.

The importance of discussion for democracy is also emphasized in educational documents. In order for citizens to adopt democratic values, they need to learn to argue and discuss, and they are able to improve their decision-making and critical thinking skills (NCSS, 2016). According to this NCSS (2016), students can experience democratic values by examining opposing views, respecting positions formed with good arguments, being sensitive and fair to cultural differences and similarities, and adhering to individual and social responsibilities. The discussion is emphasized in various parts of the social studies curriculum implemented in Turkey. The social studies curriculum stresses the importance of discussion, especially in the principles of practice (MoNE, 2018). "Current and controversial issues related to learning goals can be brought to the classroom by using different discussion techniques and associating them with problem-solving, critical thinking, using evidence,

decision making, and research skills." (MoNE, 2018). As a teaching method, the discussion is included in the curriculum, but it is not among the expected skills to be gained in the social studies curriculum.

So what is the discussion? There are several definitions of discussion method (Brookfield & Preskill, 2005; Hess, 2004; Parker & Hess, 2001). The discussion approach of this paper is in line with Parker and Hess (2001). Accordingly, a discussion is a democratic-civic skill and a teaching method. In essence, the discussion is a way of enlarging of mental capacity to perceive an issue, negotiating an issue with people, and living together with differences. Because only if a student is open-minded, he/she explores different perspectives, takes responsibility, and participates discussions successfully (Avery, Sara & Simmons, 2013). Discussion is also a teaching method that is used to improve students' comprehension, perspective-taking, and critical-thinking skills. According to the approach adopted in the research, the discussion is basically a shared inquiry of a group of people. Shared inquiry consists of a group of people engaging in a dialogic interaction based on a text or topic by reading, writing, or speaking. Dialogic interaction is supposed to be reciprocal, not individual or in isolation. Object, topic, text, or theme of the discussion are shared. Therefore, if the discussion is about the interpretation of a question, each participant should focus on the same question; if the discussion is about the correct interpretation of a text, the topic should be the text itself (Brookfield & Preskill, 2005).

Since discussion is crucial for sustaining and strengthening democracy, each citizen is expected to learn how to conduct a discussion. Discussion is a learned skill rather than a skill that is born together (Hess, 2004). Therefore, it is necessary to examine how to teach Discussion and Discussion as a teaching method. Brookfield and Preskill (2005) pointed out the importance of certain attitudes in the teaching of discussion. According to these researchers, in a good discussion teaching, students and teachers are expected to have attitudes of open-mindedness, participation, attention, limitation, contribution, expectation, and autonomy (Brookfield & Preskill, 2005).

Open-mindedness is actually one of the qualities of discussion. If the students feel invited to the discussion and the classroom environment is open to different ideas, expressing, objecting, or supporting will often occur (Schuitema, Radstake, Pol, & Veugelers, 2018). Participation will take place in classes where as many students as possible speak, listen, express or support democratic Discussion (Schuitema et al., 2018). The effectiveness of the discussion is dependent on the caring attitude of the students. Therefore, students are expected to follow the discussion carefully and listen with patience and interest.

On the other hand, students should be aware of the limitations of their knowledge and perspective. It will nurture the discussion if the speaker is aware that he can not know and predict everything completely but that he is aware of his limitations and the effect of his perspective on his interpretations. At the same time, the student should be aware that the discussion should support not only their development and benefit but also the development and benefit of each student in the class (Yeşil, 2003). Therefore, he should present his perspective and be open to different points of view. Thus, the students can present their views fully based on the evidence and examine the opposing views. It is also important that students express gratitude to each other for nurturing and contributing to the discussion. When any student touches on an important point and brings criticism that deserves attention, the students are expected to be thankful for doing so, which also increases mutual respect and trust. Such a discussion actually marks a dialogue in which the students aim to learn from peers. Students should expect that a discussion will bring a new understanding, perspective, clarity, and solution to the issue at hand (Parker & Hess, 2001). Otherwise, listening and effort will not be paid. Finally, students should feel autonomy. If discussion is expected to promote personal and group development, then it must be acknowledged and reinforced that individuals maintain their autonomy to put forward their own perspective and to continue to defend it against all odds. The freedom and right to maintain or express viewpoints that others sometimes do not hold or view as wrong should be given to the debaters (Parker & Hess, 2001).

Literature Review

Democratic discussions require students to experience what it is like to have a discussion. This is about bringing into the classroom the skills such as negotiating, reaching a consensus, and reconciling differences peacefully (Sen, 2019). However, when the literature is examined, it is understood that discussion is not the mainstream method or skill that is considered important in classrooms. On the contrary, several studies report that discussion is a rare phenomenon in classrooms (Chandler & Ehrlich, 2016; Flynn, 2009; Nystrand, Gamoran, & Carbonaro, 1998). In a study, it was stated that, despite its importance in democratic and active citizenship, TCs and teachers were not willing to use discussion skills or methods (Sheppard, Ashcraft, & Larson, 2011). Approximately 40% of high school teachers who participated in the research conducted by Maden & Kaya (2018) stated that discussion is not "always" beneficial. It has been stated by various researchers that the preferred approach in classrooms is mostly transferred and memorization-oriented (Schuitema et al., 2018). Although transfer and memorization aim at teaching a certain concept, they may not guarantee to fulfill the goal of democratic citizenship (Dague & Abela, 2020).

In order for the discussion to take place in the classroom environment, some formal requirements must be met. According to this view (Schuitema et al., 2018), student participation, communication between students, development, and exchange of student ideas should be supported in the discussion. The studies conducted offer a perspective on why discussion is rarely seen in the classroom environment. Hess (2004) suggested that certain attitudes and situations may prevent the use of discussion in the classroom setting. According to this view, the main difficulties in using discussion are lack of experience, confusion about what discussion is, and the belief that discussion is a god-given ability (Hess, 2004).

It can be inferred that beliefs and attitudes toward discussion effect the frequency of discussion methods or skills presented in the classroom. Cin Şeker (2020) has shown that the attitudes of the participants toward the discussion are important. The importance of teachers' beliefs and attitudes is also emphasized. It is understood that teachers have important roles in forming a healthy discussion and building a discussion culture (Yeşil, 2001, 2004). Larson (1999) found that when teachers think that students would not prepare enough for the discussion, they are not willing to use the discussion method. Kaviani (2006) showed that teachers' positions affect the discussion and choice of topic. Tannebaum (2017) stated that teachers who generally consider the discussion important tend to use discussion methods in their classrooms.

In one of the first studies examining attitudes towards Discussion in Turkey (Yeşil, 2004), it was emphasized that negative attitudes and behaviors of TCs would affect the discussion process significantly. In the study, it was revealed that the TCs lack certain attitudes, such as awareness of the richness of different ideas, the importance of an unbiased perspective, the contribution of discussion and love, respect, and tolerance, which are the requirements of the discussion environment. According to a recent study (Ocak & Karakuş, 2015), it is stated that prospective teachers' attitudes toward discussion were generally positive. Although several studies report on teachers' and prospective teachers' attitudes, studies of the attitudes of secondary school students on the discussion are limited in numbers. Yazıcıoğlu (2017) examined the views of teachers and students about discussion practice. It was revealed that, especially after the application, teachers and students developed positive attitudes toward the Toulmin discussion model. According to this research, the model contributes to teachers in terms of the teaching profession and students in terms of self-confidence, interest, respect, and mutual understanding.

Discussion literature (Cin Şeker, 2020; Kaviani, 2006; Larson, 1999; Ocak & Karakuş, 2015; Schuitema et al., 2018; Tannebaum, 2017; Yazıcıoğlu, 2017; Yeşil, 2001, 2004) shows that teachers are not willing to use discussion as a method or skill. One explanation would be that this situation arises from negative attitudes towards certain features of the discussion. On the other hand, it has been observed that there are studies, albeit few, that examine the discussion attitudes of TCs in the context of social studies education. TCs have both positive and negative attitudes toward discussion. The number of studies examining middle school students' attitudes toward discussion is limited in

numbers. This research aims to examine the attitudes of secondary school students, TCs, and teachers toward the discussion. Revealing the attitudes of these three groups towards discussion is thought to contribute to democratic citizenship education. Revealing stakeholders' attitudes towards discussion as an important skill and method can provide insight into how discussions take place and might take place in classrooms in the context of today and in the future.

The sub-research questions are as follows:

1. Do middle school students' argumentative attitude perceptions differ according to gender and grade level?
2. Do TCs' argumentative attitude perceptions differ according to gender and grade level?
3. Do teachers' argumentative attitude perceptions differ significantly according to gender and experience?
4. Do argumentative attitude perceptions differ significantly between secondary school students, TCs, and teachers?
5. What is the argumentative attitude perception level of teachers, TCs, and student groups?

Method

Research Model

Since the research aims to examine the attitudes of teachers, TCs, and secondary school students toward discussion in terms of various variables and to reveal the difference between the groups, the survey model, which is one of the quantitative research methods, was used. The survey model is a research model that enables the determination and evaluation of the characteristics of the participants (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012; Karasar, 2014). In the first phase of the study, researchers had the ethics committee's approval. Ethical committee approval documents' details (Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University Ethics Committee, 20.04.2022, 2021/101) are shown on the last page of the paper.

Population and Sample

The population of the research consisted of secondary school students in public schools, teachers teaching in public schools, and TCs studying at public universities in the 2020-2021 academic year. To collect data, researchers sent the survey link to teachers, TCs, and students in Rize province and asked them to share the link with colleagues and classmates. The participants' email addresses were obtained from the school principals for teachers and students. For TCs, their email addresses were attained through faculty administration. Due to pandemic conditions, the convenience sampling method was employed during data collection in this study. In some cases, when convenient sampling is utilized, it is required to identify the sample in detail in terms of demographic features (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012). To this end, the sample of the study consisted of 269 students, 617 TCs and 167 teachers determined by the convenience sampling method. Demographic information about the teachers participating in the research is presented in Table 1.

Table 1.
Demographic Information Regarding Teachers

Variable	Groups	<i>f</i>	%
Gender	Female	72	43,1
	Male	95	56,9
	Total	167	100
Professional Experience	2 years or less	13	7,8
	More than 2 years of teaching	9	5,4
	More than 5 years of teaching	42	25,1
	More than 10 years of teaching	45	26,9
	More than 15 years of teaching	33	19,8
	More than 20 years of teaching	4	2,4
	21 years or more.	21	12,6
	Total	167	100,0

Once Table 1, which includes the demographic information of the teachers participating in the research, is examined, it is seen that 72 (43.1%) of the participants are female and 95 (56.9%) are male. On the other hand, when the professional experience variable is examined, 13 (7.8%) of the participants have been teaching for 2 years (2 years or less), 9 (5.4%) have been teaching for more than 2 years, 42 (25,1 %) have been teaching for more than 5 years, 45 (26.9%) have been teaching for more than 10 years, 33 (19.8%) have been teaching for more than 15 years), 4 (2.4%) have been teaching for more than 20 years), and 21 (12.6%) have been teaching for more than 21 years appears to be.

Table 2.
Demographic Information Regarding TCs

Variable	Groups	<i>f</i>	%
Gender	Female	486	78.8
	Male	131	21.2
	Total	617	100.0
Grade	1 st	122	19.8
	2 nd	191	31.0
	3 rd	178	28.8
	4 th	126	20.4
	Total	617	100.0

When the demographic information of TCs is examined, it can be stated that a total of 617 participants, 486 (78.8%) women, and 131 (21.2%) participants, participated in the study. 122 (19.8%) of the TCs participating in the research were in the 1st grade, 191 (31%) were in the 2nd grade, 178 (28.8%) were in the 3rd grade and 126 (20.4%) were in the 4th grade.

Table 3.
Demographic Information Regarding Students

Variable	Groups	<i>f</i>	%
Gender	Female	171	63.6
	Male	98	36.4
	Total	269	100.0
Grade	4 th Grade	73	27.1
	5 th Grade	94	34.9
	6 th Grade	46	17.1
	7 th Grade	56	20.8
	Total	269	100.0

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that 171 (63.6%) of the students participating in the research were female and 98 (36.4%) were male. In addition, 73 (27.1%) of the students were in the 4th grade, 94 (34.9%) were in the 5th grade, 46 (17.1%) were in the 6th grade, and 56 (20.8%) were in the 7th grade.

Data Collection Tool

In order to collect data, the argumentative attitude scale developed by Infante and Rancer (1982) as 20 items and adapted into Turkish as 10 items by Turunç, Eser, and Dinç (2018), and a personal information form developed by the researchers were used. The argumentative attitude scale was adapted as a five-point Likert type; never, rarely, sometimes, often, and always. The fit indices of the scale, which was determined to have a two-factor structure as a result of exploratory factor analysis, were $\chi^2=325.8$, $sd=68$, $CMIN/DF=4.7$, $CFI=0.91$, $NFI=0.90$, $TLI=0.90$, $RMSEA=0.04$. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the short form of the Argumentative Attitude Scale

was calculated as .71. In the current study, the Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was determined as .72.

Data Collection

It took approximately five minutes for the participants to fill out the argumentative attitude scale applied by the researchers in the fall semester of the 2020-2021 academic year. The data collected by creating an online form was filled by a total of 1150 participants. Since there are items with chosen more than one point or left blank, the scales filled in by 97 participants were removed, and the data created by 1053 people were accepted as valid forms.

Data Analysis

Frequency and percentage distributions regarding the demographic characteristics of students, TCs, and teachers were presented, and the argumentative attitudes of the participants were determined according to the independent variables. When the skewness and kurtosis coefficients of the current study are examined, it is seen that the data collected for students is between .02- -.80, the data collected for TCs is between -.47 - .22, and the data collected for teachers is between -.58 - .61. It can be concluded that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients are between +1 and -1 in the research. Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, and Barrett (2004) state that the skewness and kurtosis coefficients between -1 and +1 indicate that the data are normally distributed. Obtained results were analyzed and interpreted at $p < .05$ significance level. In the data analysis process, the mean (\bar{X}) and standard deviation (SD) values as descriptive statistics, the Independent Group t-Test for two variables and One Way ANOVA for more than two variables were conducted, and Post Hoc tests were also applied to determine the source of the significant difference in descriptive statistics techniques. The first, second, and third sub-research question of the study was investigated with the Independent Group t-Test and One Way ANOVA; the fourth sub-objective was investigated with the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA); The fifth sub-objective was investigated with the arithmetic mean.

Findings

In this section, the findings obtained from the argumentative attitude scale toward students, TCs, and teachers are included. In addition to the findings for the demographic characteristics of the participants, the results of the t-test and ANOVA analysis regarding the differences in their argumentative attitudes are also included.

Table 4.

Independent Groups T-Test Results Regarding the Gender Variable of the Students

Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	sd	se	t Test		
						t	df	p
Approach	Female	171	17.46	4.573	.350	.987	267	.324
	Male	98	16.89	4.493	.454			
Avoidance	Female	171	17.17	3.920	.300	-.009	236.398	.993
	Male	98	17.17	3.192	.322			
Total	Female	171	34.63	6.572	.503	.733	223.886	.464
	Male	98	34.06	5.779	.584			

As can be seen in Table 4, as a result of the independent group t-test was performed to determine whether the scores obtained from the short form of the argumentative attitude scale show a significant difference regarding the gender variable of the students; The difference between the Approach factor ($t = .987$; $p > .05$), Avoidance factor ($t = -.009$; $p > .05$) and the arithmetic means of the groups' total scores ($t = .773$; $p > .05$) was not found statistically significant.

Table 5.

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Results to Determine Whether the Short Form Scores of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Differ According to the Grade Variable of the Students.

Estimates for N , \bar{x} and sd					ANOVA Results					
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	sd	SoV	ss	df	MS	F	P
Approach	5th Grade	73	3.5014	,82403	Between Groups Within Groups Total	65.793	3	21.931	1.063	.365
	6th Grade	94	3.4234	,96291		5466.519	265	20.628		
	7th Grade	46	3.2696	,91138		5532.312	268			
	8th Grade	56	3.5750	,91617						
	Total	269	3.4498	,90869						
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	sd	SoV	Ss	df	MS	F	P
Avoidance	5th Grade	73	3.5534	.83568	Between Groups Within Groups Total	142.728	3	47.576	3.647	.013
	6th Grade	94	3.5191	.68553		3457.406	265	13.047		
	7th Grade	46	3.1478	.66858		3600.134	268			
	8th Grade	56	3.3714	.66325						
	Total	269	3.4342	.73303						
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	sd	SoV	ss	df	MS	F	P
Total	5th Grade	73	3.5274	.64383	Between Groups Within Groups Total	317.132	3	105.711	2.724	.045
	6th Grade	94	3.4713	.60564		10284.400	265	38.809		
	7th Grade	46	3.2087	.63310		10601.532	268			
	8th Grade	56	3.4732	.61570						
	Total	269	3.4420	.62895						

As can be seen in Table 5, as a result of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed to determine whether the arithmetic means of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form differ significantly according to the grade variable, the difference between the approach factor ($F=1.063$; $.365$) and the arithmetic mean of the grade groups was not found statistically significant. On the other hand, the difference between the arithmetic means of the grade groups belonging to the avoidance factor ($F=3.647$; $.013$) and the total score ($F=2.724$; $.045$) was found to be statistically significant. Complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were used to determine which groups caused the significant difference determined after ANOVA.

Table 6.

The Results of the LSD Test Performed to Determine Between Which Groups the Avoidance Sub-Dimension and the Total Score of the Scale Differ According to the Grade Variable

	Groups (i)	Groups (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	SE	P
Avoidance	5th Grade	6th Grade	.171	.563	.761
		7th Grade	2.028	.680	.003
		8th Grade	.910	.642	.157
	6th Grade	5th Grade	-.171	.563	.761
		7th Grade	1.857	.650	.005
		8th Grade	.739	.610	.227
	7th Grade	5th Grade	-2.028	.680	.003
		6th Grade	-1.857	.650	.005
		8th Grade	-1.118	.719	.121
	8th Grade	5th Grade	-.910	.642	.157
		6th Grade	-.739	.610	.227
		7th Grade	1.118	.719	.121

Table 6 continues

		6th Grade	.561	.972	.564
	5th Grade	7th Grade	3.187	1.173	.007
		8th Grade	.542	1.107	.625
		5th Grade	-.561	.972	.564
	6th Grade	7th Grade	2.626	1.121	.020
Total		8th Grade	-.019	1.052	.985
		5th Grade	-3.187	1.173	.007
	7th Grade	6th Grade	-2.626	1.121	.020
		8th Grade	-2.645	1.240	.034
		5th Grade	-.542	1.107	.625
	8th Grade	6th Grade	.019	1.052	.985
		7th Grade	2.645	1.240	.034

Table 6 shows that as a result of the post-hoc LSD test performed to determine between which subgroups the students' avoidance factor scores differed according to the grade variables of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form and there was a statistically significant difference ($p < .01$) between the 5th grade and 7th-grade groups in favor of the 5th-grade group. Also statistically significant ($p < .01$) difference was determined between the 6th-grade group and the 7th-grade group in favor of the 6th-grade group.

When the scale was examined in terms of the total score, a statistically significant difference ($p < .01$) was found between the 5th-grade group and the 7th-grade group in favor of the 5th-grade group. A statistically significant difference was found between the 6th-grade group and the 7th-grade group at the level of ($p < .01$) in favor of the 6th-grade group. Also, there was a statistically significant ($p < .01$) difference between the 8th-grade group and the 7th-grade group in favor of the 8th-grade group.

Table 7.

Independent Groups T-Test Results Regarding the Gender Variable of TCs

Factors	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	sd	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i> Test df	<i>p</i>
Approach	Female	486	19.0823	3.62884	.16461	-1.786	615	.075
	Male	131	19.7099	3.33625	.29149			
Avoidance	Female	486	16.8230	3.23154	.14659	-2.757	615	.006
	Male	131	17.7023	3.26919	.28563			
Total	Female	486	35.9053	5.90957	.26806	-2.604	615	.009
	Male	131	37.4122	5.76044	.50329			

Table 7 shows that as a result of the independent group t-test was conducted to determine whether the scores obtained from the short form of the argumentative attitude scale show a significant difference regarding the gender variable of the TCs. While there was no statistically significant difference between the approach factor ($t = -1.786$; $p > .05$) and the groups; however, the difference between the arithmetic means of groups regarding avoidance factor ($t = -2.757$; $p < .05$) and total scores ($t = -2.604$; $p < .05$) was found to be statistically significant.

Table 8.

The Results of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Conducted to Determine Whether the TCs Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form Scores Differ According to The Grade Variable.

Estimates for N , \bar{x} and sd					ANOVA Results					
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	sd	SoV	ss	df	MS	F	P
Approach	Undergraduate – 1 st Grade	122	19.36	3.69	Between Groups	130.829	3	43.610	3.452	.016
	Undergraduate – 2 nd Grade	191	18.54	3.69						
	Undergraduate – 3 rd Grade	178	19.67	3.52	Total	7874.331	616			
	Undergraduate – 4 th Grade	126	19.43	3.23						
	Total	617	19.21	3.57						
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	Sd	SoV	ss	df	MS	F	P
Avoidance	Undergraduate – 1 st Grade	122	16.84	3.04	Between Groups	38.185	3	12.728	1.201	.309
	Undergraduate – 2 nd Grade	191	16.82	2.99						
	Undergraduate – 3 rd Grade	178	16.98	3.50	Total	6533.942	616			
	Undergraduate – 4 th Grade	126	17.48	3.46						
	Total	617	17	3.25						
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	Sd	SoV	ss	df	MS	F	P
Total	Undergraduate – 1 st Grade	122	36.20	5.78	Between Groups	231.648	3	77.216	2.227	.084
	Undergraduate – 2 nd Grade	191	35.37	5.77						
	Undergraduate – 3 rd Grade	178	36.65	6.17	Total	21485.686	616			
	Undergraduate – 4 th Grade	126	36.92	5.73						
	Total	617	36.22	5.90						

As a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine whether the arithmetic means of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form shows a significant difference according to the grade variable of the TCs; the difference between the approach factor ($F=3.452$; .016) and the arithmetic mean of the grade groups was found to be statistically significant. On the other hand, the difference between the arithmetic means of the grade groups belonging to the avoidance factor ($F=1.201$; .309) and the total score ($F=2.227$; .084) was not found statistically significant. Complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were used to determine which groups caused the significant difference determined after ANOVA.

Table 9.

The Results of The LSD Test Conducted to Determine Between Which Groups the TCs Approach Factor Scores Differ According to the Grade Variable

Factor	Groups (i)	Groups (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	SE	<i>p</i>
Approach	Undergraduate – 1 st Grade	Undergraduate – 2 nd Grade	.81092	.41192	.049
		Undergraduate – 3 rd Grade	-.31350	.41774	.453
		Undergraduate – 4 th Grade	-.07585	.45144	.867
	Undergraduate – 2 nd Grade	Undergraduate – 1 st Grade	-.81092	.41192	.049
		Undergraduate – 3 rd Grade	-1.12442	.37028	.002
		Undergraduate – 4 th Grade	-.88677	.40791	.030
	Undergraduate – 3 rd Grade	Undergraduate – 1 st Grade	.31350	.41774	.453
		Undergraduate – 2 nd Grade	1.12442	.37028	.002
		Undergraduate – 4 th Grade	.23765	.41379	.566
	Undergraduate – 4 th Grade	Undergraduate – 1 st Grade	.07585	.45144	.867
		Undergraduate – 2 nd Grade	.88677	.40791	.030
		Undergraduate – 3 rd Grade	-.23765	.41379	.566

As seen in Table 9, the post-hoc LSD test was conducted after the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine between which subgroups the scores of the avoidance factor of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form differ according to the grade variables of the TCs. A statistically significant ($p < .05$) difference was found between the Undergraduate –1st-grade group and the Undergraduate –2nd-grade group in favor of the Undergraduate - 1st-grade group. There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in favor of the Undergraduate - 3rd-grade group between the Undergraduate - 3rd-grade group and the Undergraduate - 2nd-grade group. There was a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) in favor of the Undergraduate - 4th-grade group between the Undergraduate - 4th-grade group and the Undergraduate - 2nd-grade group.

Table 10.

Independent Groups T-Test Results Regarding the Gender Variable of Teachers

Factors	Groups	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	sd	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>t</i> Test df	<i>p</i>
Approach	Female	72	18.13	4.315	.509	-.687	114.869	.494
	Male	95	18.53	2.805	.288			
Avoidance	Female	72	16.46	3.816	.450	-1.376	165	.171
	Male	95	17.18	2.953	.303			
Total	Female	72	34.58	5.971	.704	-1.295	135.852	.198
	Male	95	35.71	4.927	.505			

As seen in Table 10, as the result of the independent group t-test conducted to determine whether the scores obtained from the short form of the argumentative attitude scale show a significant difference for the variable of teachers' gender; the difference between the arithmetic means of the approach factor ($t = -.687$; $p > .05$), avoidance factor ($t = -1.376$; $p > .05$) and the total score ($t = -1.295$; $p > .05$) was not found statistically significant.

Table 11.

Results of One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Conducted to Determine Whether the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form Scores Differ According to The Variable of Teachers' Professional Experience

		Estimates for N , \bar{x} and sd			ANOVA Results					
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	sd	SoV	ss	df	MS	F	P
Approach	0-2 years of teaching	13	17.85	5.289	Between Groups Within Groups Total	56.080	6	9.347		
	2-4 years of teaching	9	16.56	2.833						
	5-9 years of teaching	42	18.38	3.800						
	10-14 years of teaching	45	18.24	3.199						
	15-19 years of teaching	33	18.85	3.519						
	20 years of teaching	4	17.25	3.403						
	21+ years of teaching	21	19.05	2.636						
	Total	167	18.35	3.530						
Avoidance	0-2 years of teaching	13	16.23	4.640	Between Groups Within Groups Total	25.585	6	4.264		
	2-4 years of teaching	9	16.56	3.206						
	5-9 years of teaching	42	17.31	3.758						
	10-14 years of teaching	45	16.87	3.123						
	15-19 years of teaching	33	16.76	3.113						
	20 years of teaching	4	15.25	2.500						
	21+ years of teaching	21	17.00	2.933						
	Total	167	16.87	3.361						
Total	0-2 years of teaching	13	34.08	4.804	Between Groups Within Groups Total	115.739	6	19.290		
	2-4 years of teaching	9	33.11	4.226						
	5-9 years of teaching	42	35.69	6.346						
	10-14 years of teaching	45	35.11	5.082						
	15-19 years of teaching	33	35.61	5.662						
	20 years of teaching	4	32.50	5.802						
	21+ years of teaching	21	36.05	4.555						
	Total	167	35.22	5.414						

As seen in Table 11, as a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine whether the arithmetic means of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form show a significant difference according to the variable of teachers' professional experience; however, the difference between the arithmetic means of the professional experience groups belonging to the approach factor ($F=3.743$; .616), avoidance factor ($F=.369$; .898) and the total score ($F=.650$; .690) was not found statistically significant.

Table 12.

One-Way Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Results to Determine Whether the Short Form Scores of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Differ According to the Title Variable

Estimates for N , \bar{x} and sd					ANOVA Results					
Factors	Groups	N	\bar{x}	sd	SoV	ss	df	MS	F	P
Approach	TCs	617	19.2156	3.57533	Between Groups Within Groups Total	734.297	2	367.14	24.912	.000
	Teacher	167	18.3533	3.52970						
	Student	269	17.2491	4.54345						
	Total	1053	18.5764	3.92529						
Avoidance	TCs	617	17.0097	3.25685	Between Groups Within Groups Total	9.968	2	4.98	.436	.647
	Teacher	167	16.8683	3.36092						
	Student	269	17.1710	3.66515						
	Total	1053	17.0285	3.38010						
Total	TCs	617	36.2253	5.90588	Between Groups Within Groups Total	639.635	2	319.81	9.088	.000
	Teacher	167	35.2216	5.41351						
	Student	269	34.4201	6.28951						
	Total	1053	35.6049	5.97775						

As can be seen in Table 12, as a result of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) performed to determine whether the arithmetic means of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form show a significant difference according to the title variable; the difference between the arithmetic means of the title groups belonging to the avoidance factor ($F=.436$; $.647$) was not statistically significant. The difference between the arithmetic means of the title groups belonging to the approach factor ($F=24.912$; $.000$) and the total score ($F=9.088$; $.000$) was found to be statistically significant. After this process, complementary post-hoc analysis techniques were used to determine which groups caused the significant difference determined after ANOVA.

Table 13.

The Results of the LSD Test Conducted to Determine Between Which Groups the Approach Sub-Dimension and the Total Score of the Short Form of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Differ According to the Title Variable.

Factor	Groups (i)	Groups (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	SE	p
Approach	TCs	Teacher	.86227	.33487	.010
		Student	1.96649	.28049	.000
	Teacher	TCs	-.86227	.33487	.010
		Student	1.10422	.37820	.004
	Student	TCs	-1.96649	.28049	.000
		Teacher	-1.10422	.37820	.004
Total	TCs	Teacher	1.00373	.51747	.053
		Student	1.80521	.43343	.000
	Teacher	TCs	-1.00373	.51747	.053
		Student	.80148	.58443	.171
	Student	TCs	-1.80521	.43343	.000
		Teacher	-.80148	.58443	.171

As seen in Table 13, as a result of the post-hoc LSD test after one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), which was conducted to determine which subgroups differed in the approach factor scores of the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form; a statistically significant ($p<.01$) difference was found between the TCs teacher group and the teacher and student groups in favor of the TCs group. A

statistically significant ($p < .01$) difference was determined in favor of the teacher group between the teacher group and the student group. When the total score of the scale was examined, a statistically ($p < .00$) significant difference was found between the TCs group and the student group in favor of the TCs group.

Table 14.

Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Participants Regarding the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form and Its Sub-Dimensions

Scale and sub-dimensions	n	\bar{x}	S	Minimum	Maximum
Approach	167	3.67	.70594	1.00	5.00
Avoidance	167	3.37	.67218	1.00	5.00
Total	167	3.52	.54135	1.60	4.90

Since the scale has a five-point Likert structure, in accordance with the formula level range = range/number of levels' (Ünver and Gamgam, 2008); 1.00-1.80 is considered very low, 1.81-2.60 is considered low, 2.61-3.40 is considered medium, 3.41-4.20 is considered high, and 4.21-5.00 is considered as very high level.

When Table 14 is examined, the lowest score obtained from the approach factor of the argumentative attitude scale short form, whose participants are teachers, is calculated as 1.00, the highest score is 5.00, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale is calculated as 3.67. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean of the approach dimension of the teachers is at a high level. The lowest score obtained from the avoidance factor was 1.00, the highest score was 5.00, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale was calculated as 3.37. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean of the teachers' avoidance factor is at a moderate level. The lowest score obtained from the total score was calculated as 1.60, the highest score as 4.90, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale as 3.52. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean of the short form of the teachers' argumentative attitude scale is high.

Table 15.

Descriptive Statistics of TCs Regarding the Argumentative Attitude Scale Short Form and Its Sub-Dimensions

Scale and sub-dimensions	n	\bar{x}	S	Minimum	Maximum
Approach	784	3.80	.71618	1.00	1.00
Avoidance	784	3.39	.65553	5.00	5.00
Total	784	3.60	.58157	1.60	5.00

When Table 15 is examined, the lowest score obtained by the TCs from the approach factor is 1.00, the highest score is 5.00, and the average of the scores obtained from the scale is calculated as 3.80. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean of the approach dimension of the TCs is at a high level. The lowest score obtained from the avoidance factor was 1.00, the highest score was 5.00, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale was calculated as 3.39. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean of the avoidance factor of the TCs is at a moderate level. The lowest score obtained from the total score of the scale was calculated as 1.60, the highest score was 5.00, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale was calculated as 3.60. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean of the short form of the TCs argumentative attitude scale is high.

Table 16.

Descriptive Statistics of Students Regarding the Short Form and Sub-Dimensions of the Argumentative Attitude Scale

Scale and sub-dimensions	n	\bar{x}	S	Minimum	Maximum
Approach	269	3.4498	.90869	1.00	5.00
Avoidance	269	3.4342	.73303	1.00	5.00
Total	269	3.4420	.62895	1.80	4.90

When Table 16 is examined, the lowest score obtained by the students from the approach factor is 1.00, the highest score is 5.00, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale is calculated as 3.44. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean of the approach factor of the students is at a high level. The lowest score obtained from the avoidance factor was 1.00, the highest score was 5.00, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale was calculated as 3.43. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean scores of the students' avoidance factor are at a high level. The lowest score obtained from the scale total score was calculated as 1.80, the highest score as 4.90, and the mean of the scores obtained from the scale was calculated as 3.44. When the classification interval is examined, it can be stated that the mean scores of the students' argumentative attitude scale short form are at a high level.

Discussions, Results and Implications

The research aimed to examine the attitudes of three participant groups, consisting of social studies teachers, secondary school students, and prospective teachers, towards the discussion. Democratic education and democratic citizenship need to reveal the attitudes of teachers, prospective teachers, and secondary school students toward the discussion.

In light of the research findings, several conclusions were drawn. The first of these is related to the discussion attitudes of teachers. There is no significant attitude difference between male and female teachers or between less experienced and experienced teachers. When the discussion attitude scale is examined in terms of the approaching sub-dimension, the relevant average is high; the mean of the avoidance sub-dimension is moderate and it is observed that the average of the total scale is high. This is important because it shows that teachers generally find discussion, which is both a skill and a method (Parker and Hess, 2001), as a helpful interaction. Maden and Kaya (2018) show that a significant portion of teachers working in secondary education institutions finds discussion beneficial as a form of communication, and most of them benefit from the discussion method as a teaching tool. The study also confirmed the findings presented by Pala (2020). In addition, it has been stated in this research that teachers do not have sufficient knowledge about discussion-based techniques as a teaching method. Similar results were reached by Tokdemir and Hayta (2014), who examined the views of teachers about the use of the discussion method in history lessons. It has been revealed that history teachers generally have positive views of the discussion method. Teachers reported that they have been using the method in history lessons. However, it was concluded that the discussions took place mostly in the form of "recitation/memorizing" and "purposeless conversations." It can be said that the teachers participating in this research also have positive attitudes toward the discussion. Therefore, the research results support the findings reported by Maden and Kaya (2018) and Tokdemir and Hayta (2014).

On the other hand, this research shows that teachers both approach and avoid discussion. Considering together with the related studies (Maden and Kaya, 2018; Tokdemir and Hayta, 2014), it turns out that teachers approach discussion, but they need more knowledge and experience to have a healthy discussion or to use the discussion as a teaching method. This result is consistent with discussion pedagogy literature which stresses that teachers avoid discussion method since it is perceived as dangerous (Cohen, 2020; McAvoy, Lowery, Wafa, and Byrd, 2020; Larson, 2000).

The second result is about prospective teachers. Prospective teachers' average of the approach sub-dimension is observed to be high as are teachers'. Cin Seker (2020), Ocak and Gurbuz (2015) found that discussion attitudes of prospective teachers change by grade level or gender, but for Ocak and Gurbuz (2015), male TCs' awareness average is higher than female counterparts. Contrary to Cin Seker (2020) and Ocak and Gurbuz (2015), male TCs' average of the avoidance sub-dimension is higher than that of female TCs'. Furthermore, attitudes to the discussion vary by grade level. Freshmen level and senior level TCs approach sub-dimension average is higher than that of sophomores and juniors. Studies focusing on TCs' attitudes toward the discussion have revealed various findings. The study conducted by Yeşil (2004) reported that TCs have negative attitudes toward the discussion method. Cin Şeker (2020) examined the attitudes of Turkish TCs toward the discussion and concluded that reading 5-6 books per month positively affects attitudes toward the discussion. Ocak and Karakuş (2015) showed that prospective teachers' attitudes toward the discussion

are positive. On the other hand, the same study indicated that there are concerns that the discussion may lead to negative consequences. Similar findings to the study of Ocak and Karakuş (2015) emerged in this study as well. First of all, it was observed that the average of the prospective teachers' approach sub-dimension is observed to be high. On the other hand, it is also revealed that TCs avoided the discussion. The fact that the mean of prospective teachers' avoidance sub-dimension is moderate can be seen as a finding that intersects with mentioned studies (Cin Şeker, 2020; Ocak and Karakuş, 2015; Yeşil, 2004). Therefore, it is understood that the prospective teachers who participated in this research have positive attitudes toward the discussion but also hesitate to enter into the discussion. As it is for teachers, prospective teachers are also hesitant about the discussion. These basic findings are consistent with research showing that prospective teachers need more experience in using Discussion (Conrad, Reisman, Jay, Patterson, Eisman, Kaplan, and Chan, in press; Riesman, Cipparone, Jay, Monte-Sano, Kavanagh, McGrew, and Fogo, 2019) suggest.

The third and final result of the research is about secondary school students. The middle school students who participated in the research have a high average regarding the approach sub-dimension. It is now generally accepted that discussion helps improve civic skills and attitudes (Parker, 2010; Parker and Hess, 2001). The present study showed that secondary students have positive attitudes toward the discussion. Still, attitudes to the discussion vary by grade level. The avoidance sub-dimension of 5-grade level students is higher than that of 6 and 7-grade level students. The literature delineates that secondary school students who exchange ideas with each other, try to create counter-arguments to opposing ideas, and therefore engage in scientific discussion will likely have positive attitudes toward the Discussion (Özden Köse, Bayram, and Parlak 2021; Schuitema et al., 2018; Brookfield and Preskill, 2005). When the discussion attitude scale was examined in terms of the approach sub-dimension, it was observed that the approach averages of the students who participated in the research were high. Demirel (2015) revealed that the argumentation technique had a positive effect on students' discussion attitudes.

These two studies conducted with secondary school students show the effect of classroom practices in increasing students' approach attitudes. Unlike the study conducted by Özden Köse, Bayram, and Parlak (2021), it was observed in this study that students' avoidance attitudes are also high. As it is in the averages of teachers and prospective teachers, secondary school students have similar avoidance and approach tendencies. It is understood that discussion practices (Demirel, 2015), in-class exchange of ideas, and discussions (Özden Köse, Bayram, and Parlak, 2021) will increase the tendency to approach and decrease the tendency to avoid.

The results of the research have reached notable results regarding the discussion attitudes of teachers, students, and prospective teachers. It is inferred that there is no significant difference regarding the attitudes of teachers, students, and prospective teachers toward the discussion. It can be said that the attitudes of the participant groups toward the approach sub-dimension are positive because it was observed that the approximation sub-dimension averages were high for each group. Another result of the research is that the averages of the participant groups for avoidance tendencies are not low. The mean of the avoidance sub-dimension is not low for any group. Student averages for the avoidance sub-dimension are high, while the averages of teachers and prospective teachers are moderate. These two results show that teachers, students, and prospective teachers avoid engaging in the discussion even though they have positive attitudes toward the discussion.

Related results suggest that teachers, students, and prospective teachers have conflicting feelings (Infante and Rancer, 1982) regarding the discussion. It has been stated that people with this type of attitude enter the discussion only when they realize they would be successful (Infante and Rancer, 1982). Therefore, people with conflicting feelings about discussion do not see the discussion as an exciting intellectual challenge but are active in situations where they can win the discussion.

There may be several reasons for having conflicting feelings. For example, Alkın-Şahin and Demirkasimoğlu (2015) stated that philosophical, sexual issues, political, and religious are not supposed to be discussed in the classroom environment, and the discussion of related issues is avoided. On the other hand, Yeşil (2004) stated that the lack of knowledge about the purpose of the discussion and the responsibilities of the participants before and during the discussion negatively

affected the discussion process. Seeing the discussion as related to behaviors such as contention, conflict, verbal attack, and insult will also negatively affect the discussion and increase avoidance behavior. Certain practices can be suggested to eliminate conflicting feelings and improve discussion attitudes.

Participating in a carefully planned and conducted discussion can reduce the tendency to avoid. Such discussions will reduce the participants' fear and anxiety about the Discussion (Şengül and Demirel, 2021). It is not expected that the tendency of avoidance would be high in classrooms where the participants respect each other, are curious about, and are open to benefit from the opinions of their counterparts. Therefore, in classrooms where the discussion method is used, and the discussion attitudes of the participants are reinforced, opinions should be listened carefully, welcomed, and supported (Maden and Kaya, 2018; Alkın-Şahin and Demirkasimoğlu, 2015).

In some cases, when convenient sampling is utilized, it is required to identify the sample in detail in terms of demographic features (Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun, 2012). Due to pandemic conditions, the convenience sampling method was employed during data collection in this study. For this reason, there is a limitation to the generalizability of the results of the study. Based on the results, a few suggestions can be offered to researchers. As stated before, the participants are willing to discuss. Although there is an average difference based on grade level in prospective teachers and secondary school students, it is true to state that participants perceive discussion as a positive interaction. However, it is understood that some obstacles prevent the participants from participating in the discussion. Perceiving the discussion as a dangerous interaction will negatively affect and increase avoidance. Certain practices can provide suitable environments for healthy discussion. Both teachers and secondary school level students must more often encounter the conception of discussion as well as the practice of discussion. One way to have more practice is to employ discussion teaching methods. Techniques such as seminars, panels, discussions, and debates are used both for democratic interaction and teaching content knowledge. It is also true for teacher education. Prospective teachers would try and use discussion methods in practice-based courses such as Social Studies Teaching or Teaching Practice. Case studies focusing on the implementation of methods would shed light on discussion literature. The relevant situation can be examined by research that includes process observation. For example, the approach and avoidance attitudes of teachers, students, and prospective teachers during the teaching practices supported by the discussion method can be revealed through long-term observations in research designed with qualitative research methods. In such a study, it can be reported which situations approach and avoidance attitudes occur. Revealing participant perspectives on relevant situations with the interview technique can also provide an important window into the literature.

Lisans Bilgileri

e-Kafkas Eğitim Arařtırmaları Dergisi'nde yayınlanan eserler Creative Commons Atıf ticari olmayan 4.0 uluslar arası lisansı ile lisanslanmıřtır.

Copyrights

The works published in e-Kafkas Journal of Educational Research are licensed under a Creative Common Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License.

Etik Beyannamesi

Bu alıřmada “Yükseköğretim Kurumları Bilimsel Arařtırma ve Yayın Etięi Yönergesi” kapsamında belirtilen kurallara uyulduęunu ve “Bilimsel Arařtırma ve Yayın Etięine Aykırı Eylemler” bařlıęı altında belirtilen eylemlerden hiçbirini gerekleřtirmedięimizi beyan ederiz. Aynı zamanda yazarlar arasında ıkar atıřmasının olmadığını, tüm yazarların alıřmaya katkı saęladığımı ve her türlü etik ihlalinde sorumluluęun makale yazarlarına ait olduęunu bildiririz.

Etik Kurul İzin Bilgileri

Etik kurul adı:Recep Tayyip Erdoğan Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beřeri Bilimler Etik Kurulu,

Etik kurul karar tarihi: 20.04.2021

Etik kurul belgesi sayı numarası: 2021/101

References

- Alkın-Şahin, S. & Demirkasımoğlu, N. (2015). Prospective teachers' opinions of argument culture in the classroom environment. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research*, 5(2), 119-142.
- Altınkök, S. (2015). Müzakereci demokrasi ve uygulama yöntemi olarak “vatandaş jürileri” yaklaşımı. *Uyuşmazlık Mahkemesi Dergisi*, (6), 1-39.
- Avery, P. G., Levy, S. A., & Simmons, A. M. (2013). Deliberating controversial public issues as part of civic education. *The Social Studies*, 104(3), 105-114.
- Chandler, P. T., & Ehrlich, S. (2016). The use of discussion protocols in social studies. *Councilor: A Journal of the Social Studies*, 77(1), 1-12.
- Christopher T. D., & Janelle K. A. (2020). Fostering democratic citizenship through discussion pedagogy. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 56(1), 42-46.
- Cohen, A. (2020). Teaching to discuss controversial public issues in fragile times: Approaches of Israeli civics teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 89, 1-11.
- Conrad, J., Reisman, A., Jay, L., Patterson, T., Eisman, J. I., Kaplan, A., & Chan, W. (in press). To what ends? Analyzing teacher candidates' goals and perceptions of student talk in social studies discussions. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2022.01.003>
- Cin Şeker, Z. (2020). Attitudes of Turkish teacher candidates towards discussion. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 16(2), 993-1005.
- Dahl, R. A. (2010). *Demokrasi üzerine*. Ankara: Phoenix.
- Demirel, R. (2015). Argümantasyon destekli öğretimin öğrencilerin kavramsal anlama ve tartışma istekliliklerine etkisi. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 24(3), 1087-1108.
- Dewey, J. (2004). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education* (1st ed.). Delhi: Aakar Books.
- Flynn, N. K. (2009). Toward democratic discourse: scaffolding student-led discussions in the social studies. *Teachers College Record*, 111(8), 2021–2054.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Held, D., Simon, L. (2006). *Habermas'ın geç kapitalizme dair kriz kuramı*. H. E. Bağcı. (Çev. Ed.). *Frankfurt Okulu*. Ankara: Doğu Batı.
- Hess, D. (2004). Discussion in social studies: is it worth the trouble?. *Social Education*, 68(2), 151-157.
- Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 46(1), 72-80.
- Karasar, N. (2014). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel.
- Kaviani, K. K. (2006). Influences on social studies teachers' issue-selection for classroom discussion: Social positioning and media. *Social Studies Research and Practice*, 1(2), 201-202.
- Larson, B.E. (1999). Influences on social studies teachers' use of classroom discussion. *The Social Studies*, 99(3), 125–32.
- Larson, B. E. (2000). Influences on Social Studies Teachers' Use of Classroom Discussion. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 73(3), 174–181.
- Maden, S & Kaya, M. (2018). Bir iletişim biçimi ve öğretim şekli olarak tartışmaya dair öğretmen görüşleri. *Iğd Üniv Sos Bil Der*, 14, 63-89.

- McAvoy, P., Lowery, A., Wafa, N., & Byrd, C. (2020). Dining with democracy: Discussion as informed action. *Social Education*, 84(5), 289–293.
- Ministry of National Education (MoNE. (2018). Sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretim programı (ilkokul ve ortaokul 4, 5, 6 ve 7. sınıflar). Ankara: MoNE Publications. Retrieved from <http://mufredat.meb.gov.tr/Programlar.aspx>
- Morgan, G. A., Leech, N. L. Gloeckner, G. W. ve Barrett, K. C. (2004). *SPSS for introductory statistics: use and interpretation*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Nystrand, M., Gamoran, A., & Carbonara, W. (1998). *Towards an ecology of learning: the case of classroom discourse and its effects on writing in high school English and Social Studies*. Albany, New York: National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement.
- NCSS. (2016). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies. *Social Education*, 80(3), 180-182.
- Ocak, G., & Karakuş, G. (2015). Pre-service teachers' attitudes towards the ability of discussion. *Trakya University Journal of Social Science*, 17(2), 153-170.
- Özden Köse, Ö., Bayram, H. ve Benzer, E. (2021). Web 2.0 destekli argümantasyon uygulamalarının ortaokul öğrencilerinin kuvvet ve enerji konusundaki başarılarına, tartışmacı ve teknoloji tutumlarına etkisi. *Erciyes Journal of Education*, 5(2), 179-207.
- Pala, Ç. B. (2020). *Tartışmalı ve hassas konuların sosyal bilgiler öğretimi bağlamında incelenmesi: bir eylem araştırması*. (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis). Marmara University Educational Sciences Institution, Istanbul.
- Parker, W. C. (2010). Listening to strangers: classroom discussion in democratic education. *Teachers College Record*, 112(11), 2815–2832.
- Parker, W. C., & Hess, D. (2001). Teaching with and for Discussion. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(3), 273–289.
- Reisman, A., Cipparone, P., Jay, L., Monte-Sano, C., Kavanagh, S. S., McGrew, S., & Fogo, B. (2019). Evidence of emergent practice: Teacher candidates facilitating historical discussions in their field placements. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 80, 145-156.
- Schuitema, J., Radstake, H., Van de Pol, J., & Veugelers, W. (2018). Guiding classroom discussions for democratic citizenship education. *Educational Studies*, 44(4), 377-407.
- Sheppard, S., Ashcraft, C., & Larson, B. E. (2011). Controversy, citizenship, and counterpublics: developing democratic habits of mind. *Ethics and Education*, 6(1), 69-84.
- Şen, A. (2019). Vatandaşlık eğitiminde değişiklik ve süreklilikler: 2018 sosyal bilgiler öğretim programı nasıl bir vatandaşlık eğitimi öngörüyor? *Journal of Qualitative Research in Education*, 7(1), 1-28.
- Şengül, K. & Demirel, A. (2021) The effect of classroom debate activities on pre-service teachers' argumentativeness. *Open Journal for Educational Research*, 5(2), 119-130.
- Tannebaum, R. P. (2017). Collective action for social justice: An exploration into preservice social studies teachers' conceptions of discussion as a tool for equity. *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 41(3), 195-205.
- Tokdemir, M. A. & Hayta, N. (2014). Tarih öğretmenlerinin tartışma yönteminin kullanılmasına ilişkin görüşlerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Türk Tarih Eğitimi Dergisi*, 3(2), 24-42.
- Turunç, Ö. , Eser, H. B. & Dinç, M. (2018). Tartışmacı tutum ölçeği kısa formunun türkçe geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik analizi. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 9(16), 731-759.
- Ünver, Ö., & Gamgam, H. (2008). *Uygulamalı temel istatistik yöntemler*. (5. Ed.). Ankara: Seçkin.

- Yazıcıoğlu, A. (2017). *Sosyal bilgiler dersinin Toulmin tartışma modeline dayalı öğretimi*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Pamukkale University Social Sciences Institution, Denizli.
- Yeşil, R. (2001). *İlköğretim düzeyinde okul ve ailenin demokratik davranışlar kazandırmadaki etkisi*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Atatürk University Social Sciences Institution, Erzurum.
- Yeşil, R. (2003). Tartışma etkinliğine ilişkin öğrenci tutum ve davranışlarının değerlendirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulama Eğitim Yönetim*, 36, 606-624.
- Yeşil, R. (2004). Öğrenci ve öğretim elemanlarının tartışma tutum ve davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Gazi Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi*, 5(2), 195-208.
- Url-1:<https://www.cumhuriyet.com.tr/dunya/endise-veren-rapor-turkiye-ayrintisi-dikkat-cekti-1886663>