The Relationship between the Teacher Autonomy and Learner Autonomy Support Behaviors

Ahmet Şakir YAZICI[1]

ABSTRACT

In the current study, the purpose is to determine the relationship between teachers' autonomy behaviors and learner autonomy support behaviors. The current study was designed in the survey model. The population of the study is comprised of teachers working in elementary, secondary and high schools located in the city of Muğla, Turkey, and its surrounding districts during the 2015-2016 school year. The sampling of the study consists of 428 teachers selected through disproportional cluster sampling technique. In the study, the Teacher Autonomy Scale and Learner Autonomy Support Behaviors Scale were used as data collection tools. In the analysis of the data, descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA, correlation and multiple regression analysis were employed. The results of the analyses revealed that the general autonomy behaviors of the teachers are above medium level. The autonomy behavior most frequently exhibited by the teachers is communication autonomy and the least exhibited is professional development autonomy. The teachers are of the opinion that they often demonstrate learner autonomy support behaviors. There is a medium level and same directional correlation between the teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. The dimensions of teacher autonomy explain 12% of learner autonomy support behaviors. Communication autonomy and teaching process autonomy are important predictors of learner autonomy support behaviors.

[1] Education Inspector, PhD student - ahmetsakiryazici@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Developments taking place in educational sciences in tandem with the scientific developments in the world have not only changed educational-instructional settings but also affected and changed the needs of teachers and students. Therefore, there is a need for new schools regulations; and, as we are in an age witnessing rapid changes, schools and educational settings cannot remain unchanged. The approaches relying on teacher authority for information acquisition for centuries have been undergoing changes and thus learning settings have been forced to change. In this process of change, in order to increase learner achievement, greater importance is being attached to the foundation of student-centered learning environments. Parallel to this change, teachers should place students at the center of his/her instruction because in a student-centered learning environment, the teacher has an indispensable role (Horstman & White, 2002, as cited in Balım, Kesercioğlu, İnel, & Evrekli, 2009). In student-centered instruction, there is a need for teachers who provide guidance for their students in the construction of knowledge, to prepare, with the participation of their students, a classroom environment designed for the effective learning of students, and to motivate them by accepting the idea that students can make their own preferences and student autonomy should be promoted (Brooks & Brooks, 1993, as cited in Oğuz, 2013b). However, in order to meet this need, teachers need to exhibit autonomous behaviors (Pearson & Hall, 1993; Short, 1994). Teachers' autonomous behaviors are gaining greater priority in terms of nurturing development at schools (Conley, Schmidle, & Shedd, 1988; Luthans, 1992; Morgan, 1997; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Smylie, 1992). For instance, it was found that when teachers have more autonomy power, their professional autonomy also improves (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1998).

Teacher autonomy can be defined as teachers' planning, implementing their professional activities within certain restrictions, making preferences in terms of the organization of the working environment and participating in administrative processes (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). According to Short (1994), teacher autonomy should be considered within the concept of empowering the teacher in relation to his/her authority and responsibilities. The topics in which the teacher should be provided with autonomy are discussed in the literature. In instructional environments, it is not correct to grant unlimited freedom to teachers. However, freedom can be given teachers in making decisions directly related to instruction (Çolak, 2016, p. 121). This freedom granted to teachers is classified differently in the literature. These are planning and implementing instruction (Freidman, 1999; Pearson & Hall, 1993; White, 1992); participating in administrative processes (Freidman, 1999; Ingersol, 2007) and developing professional capacity and skills; that is, professional development (Šteh & Požarnik, 2005). Various models have been developed concerning the concept of teacher autonomy. The most important of these models is MacBeath's (2012) professional autonomy model. According to this model, workers have control on activities.

In the literature, it is stated that teacher autonomy is needed for the private life of teachers, is effective for the job satisfaction of teachers and is indispensable for teachers to thoroughly fulfill their roles. These theoretical claims propose that autonomy decreases the stress of teachers and increases job satisfaction and professional competency (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005), decreases negative student behaviors and improves the relationships between workers (Ingersoll, 1996). Thus, it can be maintained that teachers having teacher

autonomy have higher motivation to do their job because most of the teachers state that the most satisfying aspect of their profession is to help students academically and prosper on a personal level. In this regard, teachers' developing their autonomy skills is also important in terms of arranging student-centered and constructive learning environments.

A constructivist learning environment allows arrangements to make it possible for students to construct knowledge on their own. In the construction of the knowledge, the teacher provides guidance for students. For students to construct their own knowledge, they should be encouraged by their teachers (Dolmans, Wolfhagen, Scherpbier, & Van Der Vleuten, 2003, as cited in Balım et al., 2009). Teachers' support for students' autonomy by organizing classroom environments in line with the desires of the students might contribute to the development of students' autonomy behaviors (Oğuz, 2013). Development of students' autonomy behaviors is conceptualized as learner autonomy in the literature.

The concept of learner autonomy can be defined as students' taking responsibility for their own learning (Little, 1995). Teachers supporting their students' learning autonomy can enable them to demonstrate their abilities, express their feelings and opinions comfortably, go on with their own preferences and make use of their own learning styles. The teacher's autonomy support can be seen as interpersonal behavior displayed to define, nurture and form students' sources of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985, as cited in Núñez, Fernández, León, & Grijalvo, 2015). Therefore, autonomy support is related to the creation of an environment where no pressure is put upon students to demonstrate the desired behaviors; instead, they are encouraged to just be themselves (Ryan & Deci, 2004, as cited in Núñez et al., 2015). The opposite of autonomy support is controlling. Controlling teachers tend to exhibit oppressive behaviors. However, autonomy supportive environments are stated to be conducive to the development of students (Reeve, 2009, as cited in Núñez et al., 2015). Accordingly, the teacher might be taught to adopt an autonomy supportive style to inculcate the perception that the teacher supports autonomy in students. As a result, an autonomy supportive instructional environment contributes to the development of both students and schools (Reeve, Ryan, Deci, & Jang, 2007, as cited in Núñez et al., 2015). To do so, teachers need to believe that they have to support student autonomy.

Three basic beliefs have been determined as the main determiners of whether or not teachers will exhibit high or low tendency towards autonomy supportive instruction (Roth & Weinstock, 2013, as cited in Reeve & Cheon, 2016). These beliefs are: 1) Educational environments making students more motivated provide more autonomy support; 2) Implementation of autonomy supportive instruction is easier. 3) The teacher has culturally a normative instructional belief. The teachers having this belief do not have a positive perception of autonomy supportive instruction (Turner, Warzon, & Christensen, 2011, as cited in Reeve & Cheon, 2016; Oğuz, Altınkurt, Yılmaz, & Hatipoğlu, 2014).

The students whose learner autonomy is supported develop with the effect and support of the social milieu (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In this respect, students need to be supported and encouraged within the classroom environment. The person who should provide this support is the teacher. As the teacher cannot learn instead of students, he/she should support their autonomy and encourage them to make independent decisions in the learning environment. Therefore, in constructivist learning environments, teachers have the responsibility for supporting students' autonomy. As such, teachers need to exhibit

autonomy support behaviors and to do so, they need to be able to demonstrate autonomy behaviors of their own.

Granting autonomy to teachers and empowering them seem to be important to find solutions to the existing school problems (Short, 1994). First, students should be granted with autonomy. For this, teacher autonomy is important because teacher autonomy is a pre-requisite for student autonomy (Little, 1995). The motivation of teachers who are under control and cannot exhibit autonomous behaviors is generally low (MacBeath, 2012). It is argued that the teachers having low motivation are not expected to display learner autonomy support behaviors. Within certain restrictions, the teachers who can display autonomous behaviors are expected to create a student-centered learning environment, provide students with decision options, promote learning within interaction and encourage students to reconstruct the knowledge. In this respect, teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors can be seen as closely connected with enhancing the quality of education. Assuming that teacher behaviors that are not autonomous cannot lead to learner autonomy support behaviors, determination of the relationship between autonomous teacher behaviors and learner autonomy support behaviors is believed to be important according to the literature.

The possibility that there can be a relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors is perceived in the work entitled "Truth", written by French thinker and writer Emile Zola in the 19th century to address the issue of teachers and elementary education kept under strict control:

> *Mark* (teacher), **he is following the program, but when he thinks that the program is too intense, he might prefer to make some changes on it.** *Years of experience showed that knowing does not matter much. What is more important is to understand and make use of knowledge. Therefore, he attaches great importance to lively classes and verbal explanations. He enjoys exploring the young minds full of obsession for thinking. He never remembers playing as his students do joyfully now, he could not become a cheerful student like his students, he feels as if he is an elder brother having forgotten reading and what he had learned. He gets a great pleasure from learning everything from the beginning with them. He is relearning everything with children aged at 6 years old. Grammar, arithmetic, history, geography; he feels as if he is finding very special things, as if he is seeking for the truth that he has never knew together with children and at the end he seems to have found this truth with the help of his students, which increases the students' interest in the class.* (Zola, 2011, p. 593)

In the relevant literature, there is research focusing on *teacher autonomy* (Ayral et al., 2014; Bryk et al., 1998; Çolak, 2016; Ingersoll, 1996; Karabacak, 2014; Kreis & Young Brockopp, 2001; Liu, 2007; Luthans, 1992; Morgan, 1997; Öztürk, 2011; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Smylie, 1992; Üzüm, 2014; Üzüm & Karslı, 2013) and *learner autonomy support behaviors* (Black & Deci, 2000; Çankaya, 2009; Freidman, 1999; Gömleksiz & Bozpolat, 2012; Güvenç, 2011; Güvenç & Güvenç, 2014; Oğuz, 2013a, 2013b ; Oğuz et al., 2014; Özkal & Demirkol, 2014; Reeve, Bolt, & Cai, 1999; Scharle & Szabo, 2000; Sert, 2007; Sierens, Vansteenkiste, Goossens, Soenens, & Dochy, 2009; Usluer, 2000; Üstünoğlu, 2009). There is some international research exploring the relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy (Benson, 2007; Lamb & Reinders, 2008; Little, 1995; Vieira, 2010). This research

especially focuses on the relationship between teacher autonomy, teacher professional development and learner autonomy in the field of language teaching. According to this research, in language education, when teachers exhibit autonomous behaviors, then they can enable their students to behave autonomously in the learning environment (Benson, 2007; Little, 1995). However, no research could be found that looks at the relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors in Turkey. On the other hand, autonomy support of teachers adopting different classroom management styles might vary (Güvenç & Güvenç, 2014). Teacher autonomy can also affect learner autonomy support behaviors. In this regard, it seems to be necessary to determine teachers' teacher autonomy behaviors and learner autonomy support behaviors and the relationship between these variables. The current study is believed to contribute to theoretical and practical works directed towards the development of the quality of the profession of teaching.

Thus, the goal of the current study was to determine the relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. To this end, answers to the following research questions were sought.

1. What are the teachers' opinions about teacher autonomy?

2. What are the teachers' opinions about the necessity and demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors?

3. Do teachers' opinions about teacher autonomy and the necessity and demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors vary depending on gender, the type of the school where they work, branch and length of service (seniority)?

4. Is there a relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors?

5. Do teachers' autonomy behaviors significantly predict learner autonomy support behaviors?

METHOD

The study was designed in the survey model. Participants' opinions were determined in relation to the variables and then compared and relationships then tried to be elicited.

Population-Sampling

The population of the study comprises 9,478 teachers working in the city of Muğla, Turkey, during the 2015-2016 school year. For the sampling size to meet the criteria of 95% of the population, 369 teachers needed to be selected to make up the sampling. In the determination of the teachers to be included in the sampling, the disproportionate cluster sampling technique was employed. Considering the likelihood of incomplete and imprecisely completed questionnaires, the data were collected from 497 teachers. Of the total of 497 questionnaires, 69 were found to be incomplete or imprecisely completed; thus, a total of 428 fully completed questionnaires were involved in the analyses. Of the participating teachers, 29.9% (n=128) are elementary school teachers, 24.5% (n=105) are secondary school teachers and 45.6% (n=195) are high school teachers. Of the participating teachers, 28.3% (n=121) are classroom teachers, 61.7% (n=264) branch teachers and 10% (n=43) are the teachers of vocational courses. Of the participating teachers, 54% (n=231) are females and 46% (n=197) are males. The participating teachers' length of service ranges from 1 year to 42 years. The percentage of those whose length of service is less than 9 years is 30.8% (n=63),

whose length of service is in the range of 10-19 years is 32.2% (n=138) and whose length of service is 20 years or more is 36.9% (n=158). When the teachers' length of the service in their current institution was examined, it was found that the percentage of those working less than five years is 66.4% (n=284), in the range of 6-10 years is 18.9% (n=81), and 11 years or more is 14.7% (n=63).

Data Collection Instruments

In the current study, the Teacher Autonomy Scale (TAS) and Learner Autonomy Support Scale (LASS) were used as data collection instruments.

The Teacher Autonomy Scale was developed by Çolak (2016). The scale consists of 17 Likert-type items. The scale items can be responded to by marking one of the options ranging from (1) Strongly Disagree, to (5) Strongly Agree. There is no inversely scored item in the scale. A total score can be taken from the scale. Increasing scores taken from the scale means increasing autonomy behaviors of teachers. The scale has four sub-dimensions which are teaching autonomy, curriculum autonomy, professional development autonomy, and communication autonomy. This four-factor structure explains 63.84% of the total variance.

In order to establish the construct validity of the TAS scale, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) were run on the collected data. As a result of the EFA; factor loading values of the scale were found to be as follows: For Teaching Autonomy dimension, it was found to be ranging between 0.51 and 0.70; for Curriculum autonomy dimension, it was found to be varying between 0.60 and 0.81, and for Professional Development Autonomy dimension, it was found to be varying between 0.56 and 0.86. The goodness of fit indices obtained through CFA are as follows: $\chi^2/df=2.23$, GFI=0.90, AGFI=0.86, RMSEA=0.06, SRMR=0.06, CFI=0.97, IFI=0.97, NFI=0.94, NNFI=0.96, PGFI=0.66. The scale's item total correlation values vary between 0.47 and 0.76.

The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the TAS scale was found to be 0.82 for Teaching Autonomy, 0.82 for Curriculum Autonomy, 0.85 for Professional Development Autonomy, 0.78 for Communication Autonomy dimensions and for the whole scale, it was found to be 0.89. In the current study, reliability coefficients of the scale were calculated again and Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient was found to be 0.77 for Teaching Autonomy dimension, 0.84 for Curriculum Autonomy dimension, 0.71 for Professional Development Autonomy dimension, 0.73 for Communication Autonomy dimension and 0.87 for the whole scale.

Learner Autonomy Support Behaviors Scale (LASBS) was developed by Oğuz (2013). In LASBS, there are 16 items aiming to elicit participants' opinions about the necessity and demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors. LASBS consists of three sub-dimensions which are emotional and thinking support, learning process support, and evaluation support. From the whole of the scale, total scores can be taken for both necessity and demonstration. The scale items can be responded to with options ranging from (1) Never to (5) Always. There is no inversely scored item in the scale.

For the construct validity of the LASBS, EFA and CFA were run. According to the results of EFA, the factor loading values of the scale were found to be ranging from 0.54 to 0.73 for necessity and from 0.60 to 0.75 for demonstration. The variance explained by the three factors for necessity is 38% and 45% for demonstration. Chi-square value statistical significance levels suitable for the model constructed for the scale were calculated with CFA

as ($x^2/sd=2.33$) for necessity and ($x^2/sd=2.93$) for demonstration. In addition, other goodness of fit indices related to the model showed that the proposed model is suitable for both necessity (GFI=0.92, AGFI=0.89, RMSEA=0.064, CFI=0.97) and demonstration (GFI=0.90, AGFI=0.86, RMSEA=0.077, SRMR=0.052).

Internal consistency of LASBS was tested with Cronbach Alpha. The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the scale were found to be 0.89 for necessity and 0.92 for demonstration. In the current study, the reliability of the scale retested and according to this, Cronbach alpha coefficients were found to be 0.92 for necessity and 0.92 for demonstration. The alpha coefficients of the sub-dimensions vary between 0.81 and 0.86.

Data Analysis

In the current study, descriptive statistics, t-test, ANOVA and regression analysis were employed to elicit the participating teachers' opinions about teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. As a result of the ANOVA test, in order to determine the source of the difference, one of the multiple comparison tests, Tukey test was used. In the current study, as an absolute value, when the correlation coefficient is in the range of 0.70-1.00 then it is considered to be high, when in the range of 0.69-0.30, then it is considered to be medium and when in the range of 0.29-0.00, then it is considered to be low (Büyüköztürk, 2015).

FINDINGS

In this section, the participating teachers' opinions about teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors are presented. Then, the findings related to comparison of these opinions in relation to the variables of gender, the school where the teacher works, branch and length of service (seniority) were recorded.

The teachers' authority behaviors are above the medium level (M=3.95, S=0.58). The sub-dimensions in which the teachers behave the most autonomously can be presented in rank order as follows: communication autonomy (M=4.13, S=0.76), teaching autonomy (M=4.12, S=0.63), curriculum autonomy (M=3.81, S=0.88), and professional development autonomy (M=3.70, S=0.92). The teachers' autonomy behaviors vary significantly at the sub-dimensions of professional development autonomy [$t_{(426)}=1.48$; $p>.05$] and communication autonomy [$t_{(426)}=1.25$; $p>.05$] depending on gender. However, teaching autonomy [$t_{(426)}=2.98$; $p<.05$] and curriculum autonomy [$t_{(426)}=2.38$; $p<.05$] do not vary significantly depending on gender. The female teachers display more autonomous behaviors at these sub-dimensions when compared to the male teachers.

Depending on the branch variable, the teachers' autonomy behaviors vary significantly at the sub-dimension of professional development autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}=0.62$; $p>.05$]; yet, do not vary significantly at the sub-dimensions of teaching autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}=12.70$; $p<.05$], curriculum autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}=18.23$; $p<.05$] and professional development autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}=4.24$; $p<.05$]. The difference is between the teachers giving vocational courses and classroom and branch teachers. At these dimensions, the teachers of vocational courses exhibit fewer autonomy behaviors. On the other hand, there is no significant difference in relation to the communication autonomy sub-dimension [$F_{(2-425)}=0.62$; $p>.05$]. The teachers' autonomy behaviors vary significantly depending on the length of service (seniority) variable at the sub-dimensions of professional development autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}=0.84$; $p>.05$] and communication autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}=0.34$; $p>.05$]. However, they do not vary

significantly in relation to the sub-dimensions of teaching autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}$=3.64; p<.05] and curriculum autonomy [$F_{(2-425)}$=8.19; p<.05]. The level of possessing teaching autonomy is higher among teachers working for less than 10 years when compared to the teachers working for 20 years or more. The level of possessing curriculum autonomy is higher among the teachers working for less than 10 years than teachers working for 10 years or more.

The participating teachers stated that they find learner autonomy support behaviors "always" necessary (M=4.35, S=0.52), but they demonstrate these behaviors "often" (M=3.99, S=0.58). Among the autonomy support dimensions, the teachers think that emotional and thinking support is the most necessary (M=4.51, S=0.48) and the most frequently demonstrated (M=4.20, S=0.58). This sub-dimension is followed by learning process support (*Necessity*: M=4.30, S=0.62; *Demonstration*: M=3.89, S=0.68) and evaluation support (*Necessity*: M=4.13, S=0.75; *Demonstration*: M=3.77, S=0.78) sub-dimensions.

The teachers' opinions about learner autonomy support behaviors vary significantly depending on the gender variable. There are significant differences between male and female teachers' opinions about both the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors [$t_{(426)}$=4.57; p<.05] and their demonstration [$t_{(426)}$=3.57; p<.05]. The female teachers, when compared to the male teachers, think that they both find learner autonomy support behaviors more necessary at all the sub-dimensions (*Necessity* mean: M=4.46, S=0.44) and demonstrate more learner autonomy support behaviors in these dimensions. Furthermore, the difference between their opinions is statistically significant. The teachers' opinions about learner autonomy support behaviors vary significantly depending on the branch variable at all the sub-dimensions. Learner autonomy support behaviors do not vary significantly between the classroom teachers and branch teachers in relation to the sub-dimension of emotional and thinking support in terms of both necessity [$F_{(2-425)}$=27.05; p<.05] and demonstration [$F_{(2-425)}$=16.80; p<.05], but vary significantly when compared to the teachers of vocational courses. The classroom teachers and the branch teachers, when compared to the teachers of vocational courses, find learner autonomy support behaviors more necessary and demonstrate more of these behaviors in relation to this sub-dimension. For the sub-dimension of learning process support, all the branches differ from each other significantly in terms of both necessity [$F_{(2-425)}$=18.03; p<.05] and demonstration [$F_{(2-425)}$=21.64; p<.05]. In terms of both necessity and demonstration, there are significant differences between the classroom teachers and branch teachers and the teachers of vocational courses and between the branch teachers and the teachers of vocational courses. In terms of both necessity and demonstration, the strongest support is offered by the classroom teachers and the weakest by the teachers of vocational courses. For the sub-dimension of evaluation support, while all the branches differ significantly from each other in terms of necessity [$F_{(2-425)}$=29.93; p<.05], in terms of demonstration [$F_{(2-425)}$=13.77; p<.05] the classroom teachers and the branch teachers do not differ significantly from each other, but both differ significantly from the teachers of vocational courses. While the classroom teachers exhibit learner autonomy support behaviors more than the branch teachers in terms of both necessity and demonstration, the branch teachers exhibit them more than the teachers of vocational courses. In relation to the branch variable, the teachers' learner autonomy support behaviors did not show significant differences at all the sub-dimensions in terms of necessity and demonstration (*Necessity:* Emotional and thinking support [$F_{(2-425)}$=2.47; p>.05], learning process support [$F_{(2-425)}$=1.07; p>.05], evaluation support [$F_{(2-425)}$=1.95; p>.05]; *Demonstration:* Emotional and thinking

support [$F_{(2-425)}$=0.47; p>.05], learning process support [$F_{(2-425)}$=0.78; p>.05], evaluation support [$F_{(2-425)}$=0.32; p>.05].

In Table 1, the relationship between the teachers' opinions about teacher autonomy and the necessity and demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors is shown.

Table 1. *Relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors*

Scales		Teacher Autonomy				
	Sub-dimensions	Learning process	Instructional program	Professional development	Professional communication	General autonomy
Learner Autonomy Support (Necessity)	Emotional thinking support	0.17**	0.06	0.12**	0.16**	0.17**
	Learning process support	0.11*	0.05	0.08	0.19**	0.13**
	Evaluation support	0.20**	0.26**	0.16**	0.08	0.25**
	General necessity	0.18**	0.13**	0.14**	0.16**	0.21**
Learner Autonomy Support (Demonstration)	Emotional learning support	0.25**	0.13**	0.15**	0.22**	0.25**
	Learning process support	0.26**	0.21**	0.20**	0.21**	0.30**
	Evaluation support	0.29**	0.30**	0.21**	0.17**	0.34**
	General demonstration	0.30**	0.23**	0.21**	0.23**	0.33**

*p<.05, **p<.01

As can be seen in Table 1, there are significant relationships between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. There is a low level and same directional relationship between general teacher autonomy behaviors and general learner autonomy support behaviors (r=0.21). On the other hand, there is a medium level and same directional relationship between general teacher autonomy behaviors and general learner autonomy support behaviors demonstration (r=0.33). There is a medium level and same directional relationship between the teachers' opinions about the necessity and demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors (r=0.56).

The regression results related to the prediction of learner autonomy support behaviors by teacher autonomy behaviors in terms of necessity and demonstration are presented in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2. *Effect of teacher autonomy on learner autonomy support (necessity) behaviors*

Variable	B	Standard deviation	β	t	p	Pairwise r	Partial r
Constant	3.43	0.20	-	16.85	0.00	-	-
Instructional process	0.09	0.06	0.10	1.52	0.13	0.17	0.07
Instructional program	6.06	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.12	0.00
Professional development	0.04	0.03	0.08	1.43	0.15	0.15	0.07
Professional communication	0.10	0.04	0.13	2.54	0.01	0.19	0.12
R=0.231 $\quad$ R^2=0.053 $\quad$ $F_{(4-410)}$=5.776 $\quad$ p= 0.00							

As can be seen in Table 2, as a result of the multiple linear regression analysis conducted to reveal how the independent variables of instructional process, instructional program, professional development and professional communication, which are the sub-dimensions of teacher autonomy thought to have some effect on learner autonomy support behaviors predict learner autonomy, the independent variables together revealed a significant relationship with the necessity aspect of learner autonomy support behaviors (r=0.231) ($F_{(4-410)}$=5.776, p<.01). These four independent variables together explain 5% of the variance involved in the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors. According to standardized regression coefficients, the rank order of the effect of the predictive variables on the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors is as follows; professional communication (β=0.13), instructional process (β=0.13), professional development (β=0.08) and instructional program (β=0.00). From among the predictive variables, only the professional communication variable seems to be a significant predictor of the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors (p<.05).

Table 3. *Effect of teacher autonomy on learner autonomy support (demonstration) behaviors*

Variable	B	Standard deviation	β	T	p	Pairwise r	Partial r
Constant	2.36	0.23	-	10.20	0.00	-	-
Instructional process	0.17	0.06	0.17	2.60	0.01	0.29	0.12
Instructional program	0.06	0.04	0.08	1.23	0.22	0.23	0.06
Professional development	0.06	0.03	0.09	1.67	0.10	0.22	0.06
Professional communication	0.12	0.04	0.14	2.80	0.01	0.23	0.13
R=0.344 R^2=0.118 $F_{(4-406)}$=13.480 p= 0.00							

As can be seen in Table 3, as a result of the multiple linear regression analysis conducted to reveal how the independent variables of instructional process, instructional program, professional development and professional communication, which are the sub-dimensions of teacher autonomy thought to have some effect on learner autonomy support behaviors predict learner autonomy, the independent variables together revealed a significant relationship with the demonstration aspect of learner autonomy support behaviors (R=0.344) [$F_{(4-410)}$=13.480, p<.01]. These four independent variables together explain 11% of the variance involved in the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors. According to standardized regression coefficients, the rank order of the effect of the predictive variables on the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors is as follows; instructional process (β=0.17), professional communication (β=0.14), professional development (β=0.09) and instructional program. From among the predictive variables, only the professional communication (p<0.05) and instructional process (p<0.05) variables seem to be significant predictors of the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors.

RESULTS, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

The current study intended to determine the relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. In this regard, first of all the teacher autonomy behaviors were determined, and was found to be above the medium level. The teachers see themselves as the most autonomous in the sub-dimension of professional communication; followed by instructional process, instructional program and professional development. When this finding is compared to related findings reported in the literature, it is seen that

Çolak (2016) similarly conducted a study on elementary, secondary, and high school teachers and found teachers' general autonomy behaviors at the medium level. Again in Çolak's study (2016), it was found that while the teachers demonstrated the most autonomous behaviors for the instructional process sub-dimension, they demonstrated professional development autonomy to the lowest extent; as seen in the current study. In Karabacak's study (2014) conducted on high school teachers, it was concluded that the teachers most demonstrate instructional autonomy, followed by professional development autonomy. Üzüm (2014) worked with classroom teachers and found mean scores taken for the teachers' awareness of application types of teacher autonomy to be low.

The teachers' teacher autonomy behaviors do not vary significantly based on gender in relation to professional development autonomy and communication autonomy dimensions. However, there are significant differences between female and male teachers' opinions about teaching autonomy and curriculum autonomy sub-dimensions. Thus, it seems that at these dimensions, the female teachers behave more autonomously than the male teachers. In the literature, there are studies reporting both significant differences and insignificant differences depending on gender variable. Karabacak (2014) found that the teachers' awareness of the applicability of autonomy perceptions does not vary depending on gender variable. These findings do not concur with the findings of the current study in terms of the effect of gender on professional development autonomy and communication autonomy sub-dimensions. In a study by Üzüm (2014), it was found that the male teachers' awareness level of the application types of teacher autonomy is higher.

The teachers' teacher autonomy behaviors vary significantly depending on the branch variable except for the sub-dimension of communication autonomy. Teacher autonomy differs significantly in terms of teaching autonomy, curriculum autonomy and professional development autonomy sub-dimensions between the teachers of vocational courses and the classroom teachers and between the branch teachers and the teachers of vocational courses; however, it does not differ at the sub-dimension of communication autonomy. In terms of teacher autonomy, the branches having the highest means can be put into a rank order as follows; classroom teachers, branch teachers, and teachers of vocational courses. The branch and classroom teachers display more autonomous behaviors during the instructional process than the teachers of vocational courses. The reason for the classroom teachers to be more autonomous compared to the branch teachers and the teachers of vocational courses is their teaching the same class for four years, thus they are able to follow the development of their students and get to know them better. As a result, the classroom teachers can behave more creatively in the class in terms of autonomy according to their students' needs.

The teachers' teacher autonomy behaviors do not vary significantly depending on length of service (seniority) at the sub-dimensions of professional development autonomy and communication autonomy. In this regard, the teachers' autonomy behaviors vary significantly at the sub-dimensions of teaching autonomy and curriculum autonomy. The level of possessing teaching autonomy by teachers working less than 10 years in this profession is higher than that of teachers working in this profession for 20 years or more. The level of possessing curriculum autonomy is higher among teachers working for less than 10 years than teachers working for 10 years or more. There is some evidence related to the effect of teaching experience possessed on autonomy. While Pearson and Hall (1993) contend that there is no relationship between them, Jiang and Ma (2012) present evidence indicating the

opposite. Little (1995) stated that teachers who are really successful are always autonomous due to their sense of personal responsibility. In studies by Karabacak (2014) and Üzüm (2014), it was found that teachers' awareness levels of the application types of teacher autonomy increase with increasing level of seniority. The reason for less experienced teachers' exhibiting more autonomy behaviors in the current study can be their becoming closer to existential and progressive philosophies (Oğuz et al., 2014). In addition to this, student-centered teaching, one of the main elements of constructivist approach adopted by the Ministry of National Education in 2005 might have caused this.

The teachers are of the opinion that learner autonomy support behaviors are almost always necessary but they demonstrate these behaviors often. The teachers think that they find emotional and thinking support the most necessary and demonstrate it most frequently. This sub-dimension is followed by learning process support and evaluation support sub-dimensions. This finding concurs with the research findings in the literature. Similar findings were reported in studies conducted by Yılmaz, Oğuz, and Altınkurt (2016) with elementary and secondary school teachers; by Oğuz et al. (2014) with elementary, secondary, and high school students; and by Özkal and Demirkol (2014) with elementary and secondary school teachers. Güvenç (2011) found that although the teachers support learner autonomy to a great extent, they do not provide sufficient opportunities for their students to make their own decisions.

The teachers' learner autonomy support behaviors vary significantly depending on gender. Male and female teachers' learner autonomy support behaviors vary significantly in terms of both the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors and the demonstration of these behaviors. The female teachers are of the opinion that they find learner autonomy support behaviors more necessary for all dimensions and demonstrate them more than male teachers. In the literature, there are studies that both found and did not find differences depending on gender variable. However, regardless of statistical significance, in all the research conducted, female teachers find learner autonomy support behaviors more necessary and demonstrate them more than male teachers for all sub-dimensions of learner autonomy support behaviors. Oğuz (2013) and Özkal and Demirkol (2014) also reported gender-based significant differences, which concurs with the finding of the current study. However, Oğuz et al. (2014) and Yılmaz, Oğuz, and Altınkurt (2016) found no significant gender-based difference. Yet, the female teachers are of the opinion that they find learner autonomy support behaviors more necessary for all dimensions and demonstrate them more than the male teachers. The reason for this might be stronger belief of female teachers in existential philosophy (Oğuz et al., 2014) or male teachers' tendency to exercise more control over their students (Bozgeyikli, Sünbül, Kesici, & Ure, 2003).

The teachers' learner autonomy support behaviors vary significantly depending on branch variable. While the teachers' behaviors related to learner autonomy support do not vary between classroom and branch teachers for the sub-dimension of emotional and thinking support in terms of both necessity and demonstration, both groups of teachers' behaviors vary significantly from the behaviors of the teachers of vocational courses. For the sub-dimension of learning process support, all the branches differ from each other in terms of both necessity and demonstration. For the sub-dimension of evaluation support, while all the branches differ from each other in terms of necessity, in terms of demonstration, the classroom and branch teachers do not differ from each other, but both significantly differ

from teachers of vocational courses. The classroom teachers exhibit learner autonomy support behaviors more than the branch teachers in terms of both necessity and demonstration; on the other hand, the branch teachers exhibit these behaviors more than the teachers of vocational courses. This finding is in general compliance with the research found in the literature. Oğuz et al. (2014) and Yılmaz, Oğuz, and Altınkurt (2016) reported that the classroom teachers exhibit more learner autonomy support behaviors in terms of both necessity and demonstration than the branch teachers and the branch teachers exhibit them more than the teachers of vocational courses. According to Güvenç and Güvenç (2014), learner autonomy support behaviors displayed at elementary schools differ from the same behaviors demonstrated by mathematics and science teachers and this support is at the medium level. In the study conducted by Özkal and Demirkol (2014), it was found that while the opinions about the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors do not vary, the opinions about the demonstration of these behaviors do vary. Parallel to the above-mentioned research, the classroom teachers' opinions are more positive than the branch teachers in terms of both necessity and demonstration. In a study by Oğuz (2013), it was also reported that the elementary school teachers and high school branch teachers provide higher levels of autonomy support than teachers of vocational courses. Though not statistically significant, Emir and Kanlı (2009) found that classroom teachers displayed more autonomy support behaviors than branch teachers. The reason for the classroom teachers' providing more autonomy support behaviors than branch teachers might be their lack of concern and responsibility for preparing students for centralized exams. In this regard, Berry (2012) and Güvenç and Güvenç (2014) stated that branch teachers' expectations for their students to be successful in high school and university entrance exams might lead them to increase their controlling behaviors.

The teachers' learner autonomy support behaviors do not vary significantly depending on length of service (seniority) at all the sub-dimensions in terms of necessity and demonstration. The teachers having the highest mean in terms of necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors are those working in this profession for 9 years or less, followed by teachers working 10-19 years and 20 years and more; but the difference is not statistically significant. What is remarkable here is that although the group having the highest mean in terms of the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors consists of teachers having the shortest length of service, the same group has the lowest mean in terms of the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors. This finding concurs with the other findings reported in the literature in relation to learner autonomy support behaviors. Yılmaz, Oğuz and Altınkurt (2016) reported that while the teachers having the shortest length of service find learner autonomy support behaviors necessary to the greatest extent; the same group has the lowest mean in terms of displaying these behaviors. This finding is different from the finding reported by Özkal and Demirkol (2014), not in terms of necessity but demonstration. In the current study, the teachers with longer lengths of service have the highest mean in terms of demonstrating learner autonomy support behaviors. But, this finding does not concur with the finding of Güvenç and Güvenç (2014).

There are significant relationships between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. There is a medium level and same directional relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. There is also a medium level and same directional relationship between the teachers' opinions about the necessity and demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors. This means that autonomously

behaving teachers support their students' autonomous initiations. Actually, this is an expected situation because students' autonomy can only be supported by teachers who are not under strict control and behave autonomously. Thus, the hypothesis of the study is confirmed. Of course the ultimate expectation is that achievement of students whose autonomy is supported will be high. The findings reported by Ayral et al. (2014) indirectly support the finding of the current study that there is a significant relationship between teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. Ayral et al. (2014) found a positive and significant correlation between the autonomy levels of the teachers and the students' academic achievement levels. Moreover, the female teachers exhibit more autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors than male teachers and classroom teachers more than branch teachers. The teachers with the shortest length of service display more autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors at all the dimensions except for the sub-dimension of learning process dimension. Compliance of the findings obtained from both of the measurement scales supports this relationship. The reason for less experienced teachers' exhibiting more autonomy behaviors in the current study, except for the sub-dimension of learning process, can be their becoming closer to existential philosophy as a result of the changes recently taking place in educational policies. The finding of Oğuz et al. (2014) that less experienced teachers are closer to existential and progressive philosophies supports this finding. However, the reason for more experienced teachers to demonstrate more learner autonomy support behaviors at the sub-dimension of learning process might be because of their extensive experiences in school and classroom environments and thus having learned to manage a class better and the richness of their instructional tactics.

According to these results, it can be argued that although learner autonomy behaviors are viewed to be necessary to a greatest degree, they are not demonstrated at this degree. This might have resulted from the formation of the programs according to constructivist approach (Yılmaz, Oğuz, & Altınkurt, 2016). The reason for their not demonstrating learner autonomy support behaviors at the desired level might be because teacher autonomy is at the medium level. Reeve (2009) stated that instead of granting autonomy to their students, teachers' preferring to display controlling behaviors might be because of their sense of responsibility, personal beliefs, cultural values and expectations. Another reason, as stated by Yılmaz et al. (2016), might be because teachers might not have received sufficient training to provide autonomy for their students. Thus, in-service training programs should be organized for teachers.

The independent variables of instructional process, instructional program, professional development, and professional communication, which are the sub-dimensions of teacher autonomy thought to have some effect on learner autonomy support behaviors, predict learner autonomy support behaviors in terms of necessity. These four independent variables together explain 5% of the variance involved in the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors. The rank order of the effect of the predictive variables on the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors is as follows; professional communication, instructional process, professional development, and instructional program. From among the predictive variables, only the professional communication variable seems to be a significant predictor of the necessity of learner autonomy support behaviors.

The independent variables of instructional process, instructional program, professional development, and professional communication, which are the sub-dimensions

of teacher autonomy thought to have some effect on learner autonomy support behaviors, predict the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors. These four independent variables together explain 11% of the variance involved in the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors. The rank order of the effect of the predictive variables on the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors is as follows; instructional process, professional communication, professional development, and instructional program. From among the predictive variables, only the professional communication ($p<0.05$) and instructional process ($p<.05$) variables seem to be significant predictors of the demonstration of learner autonomy support behaviors.

In the current study, it was found that the teachers exhibit medium levels of autonomous behaviors. The teachers think that students need more information, various applications and resources. This has a great influence on the level of autonomy granted to teachers. In the current study, it was found that curriculum autonomy is close to the level of good. Thus, it seems that the teachers are of the opinion that instructional programs restrict them. That is, they sometimes want to teach more from the program and less at other times.

In the current study, it was also found that the classroom teachers display more autonomous behaviors than the branch teachers and that they also exhibit more learner autonomy support behaviors, which might indicate that elementary school teachers have more flexible instructional programs; on the other hand, secondary school teachers are working within more strictly controlled programs. Rudolph (2006) reported a completely opposite finding. Rudolph's finding is supported by the finding of Moomaw (2005). Moomaw concluded that when compared to secondary and high school teachers, elementary school teachers have to follow much stricter rules in terms of instructional program and discipline measures. Again, according to Pearson and Hall (1993), while classroom teachers have to stick to a stricter program with less flexibility, branch teachers have relatively greater freedom in terms of selecting course books, phase of teaching and evaluation techniques.

As this is the first study in this domain in Turkey, it can be suggested that further research should be conducted with different samplings for the purpose of comparing the findings of the current study with the findings to be reported from such new research.

REFERENCES

Ayral, M., Özdemir, N., Türedi, A., Fındık, L., Büyükgöze, H., Demirezen, S., & Tahirbegi, Y. (2014). Öğretmen özerkliği ile öğrenci başarısı arasındaki ilişki: PISA Örneği. *Eğitim Bilimleri Araştırma Dergisi, 4*(1), 207-218.

Balım, A. G., Kesercioğlu, T., İnel, D., & Evrekli, E. (2009). Fen öğretmen adaylarının yapılandırmacı yaklaşıma yönelik görüşlerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 27*, 55-74.

Benson, P. (2007). Autonomy in language teaching and learning. *Language Teaching, 40*(1), 21-40.

Berry, J. (2012). *An investigation into teachers' professional autonomy in England: implications for policy and practice* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). University of Hertfordshire, Hertfordshire.

Black, A. E., & Deci, E. L. (2000). The effects of instructors' autonomy support and students' autonomous motivation on learning organic chemistry: A self-determination theory perspective. *Science Education, 84*(6), 740-756.

Bozgeyikli, H., Sünbül, A. M., Kesici, S., & Ure, O. (2003). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin, öğrencileri motive etme düzeyleri ile temel psikolojik ihtiyaçlarının ilişkisel analizi. *VII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, İnönü Üniversitesi: Malatya: 9-11 Temmuz 2003.*

Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Kerbow, D., Rollow, S., & Easton, J. Q. (1998). *Charting Chicago School Reform: Democratic Localism as a Lever for Change*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2015). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Çankaya, Z. C. (2009). Özerklik desteği, temel psikolojik ihtiyaçların doyumu ve öznel iyi olma: Öz-belirleme kuramı. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, *4*(31), 23-31.

Çolak, İ. (2016). *Okul iklimi ile öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışları arasındaki ilişki: Muğla ili örneği* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Muğla Sıtkı Koçman Üniversitesi, Muğla.

Conley, S., Schmidle, T., & Shedd, J. (1988). Teacher participation in the management of school systems. *The Teachers College Record*, *90*(2), 259-280.

Emir, S., & Kanlı, E. (2009). İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerini motive etme biçimlerinin incelenmesi. *Hasan Âli Yücel Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *12*(2), 63-79.

Freidman, I. A. (1999). Teacher-perceived work autonomy: The concept and its measurement. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *59*(1), 58-76.

Gömleksiz, M. N., & Bozpolat, E. (2012). İlköğretimde yabancı dil öğreniminde öğrenen özerkliği. *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken*, *4*(3), 95-114.

Güvenç, E., & Güvenç, H. (2014). İlköğretim matematik ile fen ve teknoloji öğretmenlerinin sınıf yönetim biçemleri ve özerklik desteği algıları. *NWSA: Education Sciences*, *9*(3), 311-320.

Güvenç, H. (2011). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin özerklik destekleri ve mesleki özyeterlik algıları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, *17*(1), 99-116.

Ingersoll, R. (1996). Teachers' decision making power and school conflict. *Sociology of Education*, *69*(2), 159-176.

Ingersoll, R. (2007). Short on power, long on responsibility. *Educational Leadership, 65*(1), 20-25.

Jiang, Y. & Ma, T. (2012). A Comparative study of teacher autonomy between novice teachers and proficient teachers in the context of university English teaching reform in China. *Sino-US English Teaching, 9*(3), 963-74.

Karabacak, M. (2014). *Ankara ili genel liselerinde görev yapan öğretmenlerin özerklik algıları ile özyeterlik algıları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Kreis, K. & Young Brockopp, D. (2001). Autonomy: A component of teacher job satisfaction. *Education, 107*(1), 110-115.

Lamb, T. (2008). Learner autonomy and teacher autonomy: Synthesizing an agenda. In T. Lamb & H. Reinders (Eds.), *Learner and Teacher Autonomy: Concepts, Realities, and Responses* (pp. 269-284). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Lamb, T., & Reinders, H. (Eds.). (2008). *Learner and teacher autonomy: Concepts, realities, and response* (Vol. 1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Little, D. (1995). Learning as dialogue: The dependence of learner autonomy on teacher autonomy. *System*, *23*(2), 175-181.

Liu, X.S. (2007). The effect of teacher influence at school on first-year teacher attrition: A multilevel analysis of the Schools and Staffing Survey for 1999–2000. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 13*(1), 1-16.

Luthans, F. (1992). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

MacBeath, J. (2012). *Future of teaching profession.* Educational International Research Institute and University of Cambridge.

Morgan, D. L. (1997). *The focus group guidebook* (Vol. 1). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moomaw, W. E. (2005). *Teacher-perceived autonomy: a construct validation of the teacher autonomy scale* (Doctoral dissertation). The University of West Florida.

Núñez, J. L., Fernández, C., León, J., & Grijalvo, F. (2015). The relationship between teacher's autonomy support and students' autonomy and vitality. *Teachers and Teaching, 21*(2), 191-202.

Oğuz, A. (2013a). Öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 13*(4), 2177-2194.

Oğuz, A. (2013b). Öğretmenlerin öğrenen özerkliğinin desteklenmesini ilişkin görüşleri. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 10(1), 1-26.

Oğuz A., Altınkurt, Y., Yılmaz, K., & Hatipoğlu, S. (2014). Öğretmenlerin eğitim inançları ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Turkish Journal of Educational Studies,1*(1), 37-76.

Özkal, N., & Demirkol, A. Y. (2014). Öğrenen özerkliğinin desteklenmesinin gerekliliğine ve sergilenmesine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. *E- Journal of New World Sciences Academy, 9*(3), 293-310.

Öztürk, İ. H. (2011). Öğretmen özerkliği üzerine kuramsal bir inceleme. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 35, 82-99.

Pearson, L. C., & Hall, B. W. (1993). Initial construct validation of the teaching autonomy scale. *The Journal of Educational Research, 86*(3), 172-178.

Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly, 29*(1), 37.

Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive. *Educational Psychologist, 44*(3), 159-175.

Reeve, J., Bolt, E., & Cai, Y. (1999). Autonomy-supportive teachers: How they teach and motivate students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(3), 537.

Reeve, J., & Cheon, S. H. (2016). Teachers become more autonomy supportive after they believe it is easy to do. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 22, 178-189. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.08.001

Rudolph, L. (2006). *Decomposing teacher autonomy: A study investigating types of teacher autonomy and how it relates to job satisfaction* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68.

Scharle, A., & Szabo, A. (2000). *Learner autonomy: A guide to learner responsibility.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Sert, N. (2007). Öğrenen özerkliğine ilişkin bir ön çalışma. *İlköğretim Online, 6*(1), 180-196.

Short, P. M. (1994). Defining teacher empowerment. *Education, 114*(4), 488-493.

Sierens, E., Vansteenkiste, M., Goossens, L., Soenens, B., & Dochy, F. (2009). The synergistic relationship of perceived autonomy support and structure in the prediction of self-regulated learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*(1), 57-68.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14*(1), 53-67.

Šteh, B., & Požarnik, B. M. (2005). *Teachers' perception of their professional autonomy in the environment of systemic change*. Netherlands: Springer.

Usluer, L. (2000). *Views of teachers and administrators on why female teachers are not promoted to administrative positions* (Master's Thesis). Ankara University, Ankara.

Üstünoğlu, E. (2009). Dil öğrenmede özerklik: Öğrenciler kendi öğrenme sorumluluklarını üstlenebiliyorlar mı? *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, *5*(2), 148-169.

Üzüm, P. (2014). *Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğretmen özerkliğine ilişkin farkındalık düzeylerinin yapısal ve bireysel boyutları açısından değerlendirilmesi (İzmir ili örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi.

Üzüm P. & Karslı, M. D. (2013). Sınıf öğretmenlerin öğretmen özerkliğine ilişkin farkındalık düzeyleri. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *14*(2), 79-94.

Vieira, F. (2010). Towards teacher and learner autonomy: Exploring a pedagogy of experience in teacher education. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, *61*(1), 13-27.

Yılmaz, K., Oğuz A., & Altınkurt, Y., (2016). Öğretmenlerin liderlik davranışları ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları arasındaki ilişki. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* doi: 10.16986/HUJE.2016016394.

Zola, E. (2011). *Gerçek*. İstanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları.

Öğretmenlerin Özerklik Davranışları İle Öğrenen Özerkliğini Destekleme Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki

Ahmet Şakir YAZICI[1]

Giriş

Eğitim bilimlerinde meydana gelen gelişmeler, dünyadaki bilimsel gelişmelere koşut olarak, okullarda eğitim-öğretim ortamlarını değiştirdiği gibi öğretmen ve öğrenci ihtiyaçlarını da etkileyip değiştirmektedir. Bunun için de okullarda yeni düzenlemeler yapılması gerekmektedir. Çünkü gelişmenin olduğu çağda sabit duran bir okul ve öğrenme ortamı düşünülemez. Yüzlerce yıldır devam eden öğretmen otoritesine bağlı bilgi edinme kaynakları değişmekte ve öğrenme ortamlarını da değişime zorlamaktadır. Bu süreçte, öğrenci başarısını artırmak için öğrenci merkezli öğrenme ortamlarının düzenlemesi giderek daha fazla önem kazanmaktadır. Öğretmen de bu değişime paralel olarak öğrenci merkezli hareket etmesi gerekmektedir. Çünkü öğrenci merkezli öğrenme ortamında, öğretmenin olmazsa olmaz bir rolü vardır (Horstman & White, 2002 Akt: Balım, Kesercioğlu, İnel, & Evrekli, 2009). Öğrenci merkezli öğretimde, öğrencilerin bilgiyi oluşturmasında onlara rehber olan, öğrencilerin etkin öğrenmesi için sınıf ortamını öğrencilerle birlikte hazırlayan, öğrencinin tercih kullanmasını ve öğrenen özerkliğinin desteklenmesini kabul ederek onları motive eden (Brooks & Brooks, 1993 Akt: Oğuz, 2013b) öğretmenlere ihtiyaç vardır. Ancak bu ihtiyaçları karşılayabilmek için öğretmenlerin de özerk davranışlar göstermeleri gerekmektedir. (Pearson & Hall, 1993; Short, 1994). Öğretmenlerin özerk davranışları okullardaki gelişimin sağlanmasında giderek ön plana çıkmaktadır (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Conley, Schmidle, & Shedd, 1988; Luthans, 1992; Smylie, 1992). Yapılan araştırmalarda, öğretmenlerin daha fazla özerklik gücüne sahip olduklarında, mesleki özerkliklerinin de arttığı (Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1998) görülmektedir.

Öğretmen özerkliği, belirli sınırlılıklar içerisinde öğretmenlerin mesleki faaliyetlerini planlaması, uygulaması, iş ortamının düzenlenmesinde tercih kullanabilmesi, yönetim süreçlerine katılabilmesi olarak tanımlanabilir (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). Short'a (1994) göre öğretmen özerkliğinin, öğretmene sağlanan yetki ve sorumluluklar konusunda, öğretmenin güçlendirilmesi kavramı içerisinde düşünülmesi gerekmektedir. Öğretmenlere hangi konuda özerklik sağlanacağı alan yazında tartışılmaktadır. Öğrenme ortamlarında öğretmenlere sınırsız özgürlük vermek doğru değildir. Ancak, öğretimi doğrudan ilgilendiren kararlarda öğretmenlere özgürlük verilebilir (Çolak, 2016: 121). Öğretmenlere verilecek bu özgürlük, alanyazında farklı sınıflanmaktadır. Bunlar, öğretimi planlama ve uygulama (Freidman, 1999; Pearson & Hall, 1993; White, 1992); yönetim süreçlerine katılma (Freidman, 1999; Ingersol, 2007) ve mesleki kapasite ve becerileri geliştirme, yani mesleki gelişimdir (Steh & Pozarnik, 2005). Öğretmen özerkliği kavramı ile ilgili çeşitli modellemeler de geliştirilmiştir. Bu modellerden en önemlisi Mac Beath'ın (2012) iş özerkliği modelidir. Modele göre, çalışanlar etkinlikler üzerinde kontrol sahibidirler.

Öğrenen özerkliği kavramı, öğrencinin kendi öğrenmesi için sorumluluk alması olarak tanımlanabilir (Little, 1995). Öğrencisinin öğrenme özerkliğini destekleyen öğretmenler onların yeteneklerini ortaya koymalarını, duygu ve düşüncelerini rahatça dile

---

[1] Maarif Müfettişi, Dr. Öğrencisi - ahmetsakiryazici@gmail.com

getirmelerini, kendi seçimlerini yapmalarını, kendi öğrenme stillerini ortaya çıkarmalarını sağlayacaktır. Öğretmenin özerklik desteği, öğrencilerin içsel motivasyon kaynaklarını tanımlamak, geliştirmek ve oluşturmak için sağladığı kişiler arası davranıştır (Deci & Ryan, 1985 Akt: Núñez, Fernández, León, & Grijalvo, 2015). Bu yüzden özerklik desteği, öğrencilerin istenilen belirli biçimlerde davranmaları için baskının uygulanmadığı, bunun yerine kendileri olmaları için cesaretlendirildikleri bir ortamın yaratılması ile ilgilidir (Ryan & Deci, 2004 Akt: Núñez vd., 2015). Özerklik desteğinin zıttı kontrol etmedir. Kontrol eden öğretmenler, baskıcı davranışlar sergiler. Oysa özerklik destekleyici ortamların, öğrencilerin gelişimine olumlu katkı sağladığı belirtilmektedir (Reeve, 2009 Akt: Núñez vd., 2015). Dolayısıyla da öğretmenin, öğrenci özerkliğini desteklediği algısını öğrencilerinde oluşturması için özerklik destekleyici bir stili benimsemesi gerektiği düşünülebilir. Sonuç olarak, özerklik destekleyici bir öğretme ortamı, hem öğrencilerin hem okulun gelişimine katkı sağlamaktadır (Reeve, Ryan, Deci, & Jang, 2007 Akt: Núñez vd., 2015). Bunun için de öğretmenlerin, öğrenen özerkliğini desteklemenin gerekliliğine inanmaları gerekmektedir.

Öğretmenlerin özerklik destekleyici öğretmeye karşı yüksek ya da düşük eğilimleri olmasının temel belirleyicisi olan üç temel inanç belirlenmiştir (Roth & Weinstock, 2013 Akt: Reeve & Cheon, 2016). Bu inanışlar şu şekildedir: 1) Öğrencilerin motive olmasını sağlayan öğretim ortamları daha çok özerklik desteği sağlar. 2) Özerklik destekleyici öğretimin uygulanması daha kolaydır. 3) Öğretmenin kültürel olarak normatif bir eğitim inancı vardır. Bu inanca sahip öğretmenler de özerklik destekleyici öğretime ilişkin olumlu bir bakış açısına sahip değildir (Turner, Warzon, & Christensen, 2011 Akt: Reeve & Cheon, 2016; Oğuz, Altınkurt, Yılmaz, & Hatipoğlu, 2014).

Öğrenen özerkliği desteklenen öğrenciler, sosyal çevrenin etkisi ve desteğiyle gelişirler (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Bu anlamda öğrenciler ders ortamında isteklendirilmeye ve desteklenmeye ihtiyaç duyarlar. Bu desteği sağlayacak olan öğretmendir. Öğretmen, öğrencinin yerine öğrenemeyeceğine göre ona özerklik sağlamalı ve onu, öğrenme ortamında bağımsız kararlar alabilmesi için desteklemelidir. Bu nedenle, yapılandırmacı öğrenme ortamlarında, öğretmenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme sorumluluğu vardır. Bunun için öğretmenlerin özerklik destekleyici davranışlar sergilemeleri; ancak bu davranışı sergileyebilmeleri için öğretmenlerin de özerk davranışlar gösterebilmeleri belirtilmektedir.

Öğretmenlere özerklik verilmesi ve öğretmenlerin güçlendirilmesi, okul için önemli görülmektedir (Short, 1994). İlk olarak da öğrencilere özerkliğin kazandırılması gerekmektedir. Bunun için de öğretmen özerkliği önemlidir. Çünkü öğrenci özerkliği için bu bir gerekliliktir (Little, 1995). Kontrol altında olan ve özerk davranışlar içerisinde bulunamayan öğretmenlerin motivasyonları düşük olacaktır (MacBeath, 2012). Motivasyonu düşük olan öğretmenlerin de öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları sergilemesinin mümkün olmayacağı düşünülmektedir. Belirli sınırlılıklar içerisinde özerk davranabilen öğretmenlerin öğrenci merkezli öğretim ortamları oluşturmaları, öğrencilere karar seçeneği sunmaları, etkileşim içerisinde öğrenmeyi sağlamaları, öğrencilerin seviyelerine inerek bilgiyi yeniden üretmeleri beklenmektedir. Bu açıdan bakıldığında özerk öğretmen davranışları ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarının öğretimin kalitesinin artırılması ile ilişkili olduğu düşünülebilir. Özerk olmayan öğretmen davranışlarının öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarını yeterince sergileyemeyeceği varsayılırsa, özerk öğretmen davranışları ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesi alanyazının duyduğu bir ihtiyaç olabilir.

Alanyazında öğretmenlerin, *öğretmen özerkliği* (Ayral vd., 2014; Barnabe & Burns, 1994; Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1998; Çolak, 2016; Ingersoll, 1996; Karabacak, 2014; Kreis & Young Brockopp, 2001; Liu, 2007; Luthans, 1992; Morgan, 1997; Öztürk, 2011; Pearson & Moomaw, 2005; Smylie, 1992; Üzüm, 2014; Üzüm & Karslı, 2013) ve *öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme* davranışlarına ilişkin araştırmalar bulunmaktadır (Black & Deci, 2000; Çankaya, 2009; Freidman, 1999; Gömleksiz & Bozpolat, 2012; Güvenç, 2011; Güvenç & Güvenç, 2014; Oğuz, 2013a, 2013b; Oğuz vd., 2014; Özkal & Demirkol, 2014; Reeve Bolt, & Cai, 1999; Scharle & Szabo, 2000; Sert, 2007; Sierens Vansteenkiste, Goossens, Soenens, & Dochy, 2009; Usluer, 2000; Üstünoğlu, 2009). Yurtdışında öğretmen özerkliğinin öğrenen özerkliği ile ilişkisini inceleyen araştırmalar vardır (Benson, 2007; Lamb & Reinders, 2008; Little, 1995; Vieira, 2010). Bu araştırmalar, özellikle dil öğretimi alanında, öğretmen özerkliğinin, öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişimi ve öğrenen özerkliği üzerindeki ilişkisine vurgu yapmaktadır. Ancak öğretmen özerkliği ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışı arasındaki ilişkiyi araştıran bir araştırmaya Türkiye'de ulaşılamamıştır.

Bu kapsamda araştırmanın amacı, öğretmen özerkliği ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları arasındaki ilişkinin belirlenmesidir. Bu amaca ulaşmak için şu sorulara yanıt aranmıştır. Öğretmenlerin: 1) Öğretmen özerkliğine ilişkin görüşleri nasıldır? 2) Öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarının gerekliliği ve sergilenmesine ilişkin görüşleri nasıldır? 3) Öğretmen özerkliği ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarının gerekliliği ve sergilenmesine ilişkin görüşleri; cinsiyet, görev yapılan okul türü, branş ve kıdeme göre farklılık göstermekte midir? 4) Öğretmen özerkliği ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları arasında ilişki var mıdır? 5) Öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışları, öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarını anlamlı düzeyde yordamakta mıdır?

Yöntem

Araştırma tarama modelinde desenlenmiştir. Araştırmanın örnekleminin 2015-2016 eğitim öğretim yılında Muğla ilinde görev yapan 428 öğretmen oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada veri toplama aracı olarak Öğretmen Özerkliği Ölçeği (Çolak, 2016) ve Öğrenen Özerkliğini Destekleme Ölçeği (Oğuz, 2012) kullanılmıştır. Öğretmen Özerkliği Ölçeği Çolak (2016) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Ölçek Likert tipi 17 maddeden oluşmaktadır. Ölçeğin öğretme süreci özerkliği, öğretim programı özerkliği, mesleki gelişim özerkliği ve mesleki iletişim özerkliği olmak üzere 4 alt boyutu vardır. Söz konusu dört faktörlü yapı, toplam varyansın % 63.84'ünü açıklamaktadır. Öğrenen Özerkliğini Destekleme Ölçeği (ÖÖDÖ) Oğuz (2012) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. ÖÖDÖ'de öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarının gerekliliği ve sergilenmesine ilişkin görüşlerini ortaya koymalarına yönelik 16 madde yer almaktadır. ÖÖDÖ, duygu ve düşünce desteği, öğrenme süreci desteği, değerlendirme desteği olmak üzere üç alt boyuttan oluşmaktadır. Ölçeğin yapı geçerliği için açımlayıcı ve doğrulayıcı faktör analizleri yapılmıştır. Üç faktörün açıkladığı varyanslar gereklilik için % 38; sergilenme için % 45'tir.

Araştırma verilerinin analizinde betimsel istatistikler, ikili karşılaştırmalarda t-testi, üç ve daha fazla boyutu olan karşılaştırmalarda tek yönlü varyans analizi kullanılmıştır. Öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışlarının öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarını ne düzeyde yordadığının belirlenmesinde ise regresyon analizinden yararlanılmıştır.

Bulgular

Öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışları orta düzeyin üzerindedir (AO=3.95, S=0.58). Öğretmenlerin en çok özerk davrandıkları alt boyutlar sırası ile mesleki iletişim özerkliği (AO= 4.13, S=0.76), öğretme süreci özerkliği (AO=4.12, S=0.63), öğretim programı özerkliği (AO=3.81, S=0.88) ve mesleki gelişim özerkliğidir (AO=3.70, S=0.92).

Araştırmaya katılan öğretmenler, öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarını "her zaman" (AO=4.35, S=0.52) gerekli buldukları, ancak çoğu zaman (AO=3.99, S=0.58) sergiledikleri görüşündedirler. Öğretmenler özerklik desteği boyutları arasında en çok duygu ve düşünce desteğini gerekli buldukları (AO=4.51, S=0.48) ve sergiledikleri (AO=4.20, S=0.58) görüşündedir. Bu alt boyutu sırası ile öğrenme süreci desteği (Gereklilik: AO=4.30, S=0.62; sergileme: AO=3.89, S=0.68) ve değerlendirme desteği (Gereklilik: AO=4.13, S=0.75; sergileme: AO=3.77, S=0.78) alt ölçekleri izlemektedir.

Öğretmen özerkliği ile öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışları arasında anlamlı düzeyde ilişkiler vardır. Genel öğretmen özerkliği davranışları ile genel öğrenen özerkliğini gerekli bulma arasında aynı yönlü ve düşük düzeyde bir ilişki (r=0.21) vardır. Ancak genel öğretmen özerkliği davranışları ile genel öğrenen özerkliğini sergileme davranışları arasında aynı yönlü ve orta düzeyde bir ilişki (r=0.33) görülmektedir. Öğretmenlerin öğrenen özerkliğinin desteklemesi gerekliliğine ve sergilenmesine ilişkin görüşleri arasında aynı yönlü ve orta düzeyde bir ilişki (r=0.56) vardır.

Öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışlarının öğretmenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarının gereklilik ve sergileme açısından yordanmasına ilişkin regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışı üzerinde etkisi olduğu düşünülen öğretmen özerkliğinin alt boyutları olan öğretme süreci, öğretim programı, mesleki gelişim ve mesleki iletişim gibi bağımsız değişkenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini ne şekilde yordadığını ortaya koymaya yönelik olarak yapılan çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi sonucunda, bağımsız değişkenler birlikte öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışını gereklilik açısı ile anlamlı bir ilişki (r=0.231) sergilemişlerdir ($F_{(4-410)}$=5.776, p< 0.01). Bu dört bağımsız değişken, birlikte, öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışı gerekliliğindeki değişimin % 5'ini açıklamaktadır. Standartlaştırılmış regresyon katsayılarına göre, yordayıcı değişkenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışı gerekliliği üzerindeki önem sırası, mesleki iletişim (β=0.13), öğretme süreci (β=0.13), mesleki gelişim (β=0.08) ve öğretim programıdır (β=0.00). Yordayıcı değişkenlerden sadece mesleki iletişim (p<0.05) değişkeninin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışının gerekliliği üzerinde anlamlı yordayıcı olduğu görülmektedir.

Yine öğretmen özerkliğinin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme (sergileme) davranışları üzerindeki etkisi için yapılan çoklu doğrusal regresyon analizi sonucunda, bağımsız değişkenler birlikte öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışını sergileme açısı ile anlamlı bir ilişki (R=0.344) sergilemişlerdir ($F_{(4-410)}$=13.480, p<.01). Bu dört bağımsız değişken, birlikte, öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışını sergilemedeki değişimin % 11.8'ini açıklamaktadır. Standartlaştırılmış regresyon katsayılarına göre, yordayıcı değişkenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışı sergileme üzerindeki göreli önem sırası, öğretme süreci (β=0.17), mesleki iletişim (β=0.14), mesleki gelişim (β=0.09) ve öğretim programıdır. Yordayıcı değişkenlerden sadece mesleki iletişim (p<.05) ve öğretme süreci (p<.05)

değişkeninin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışının gerekliliği üzerinde anlamlı yordayıcı olduğu görülmektedir.

Sonuç, Tartışma ve Öneriler

Öğretmenlerin özerklik düzeyleri orta düzeyin üzerinde bir seviyededir. Katılımcı öğretmenlerin en çok özerk davrandıkları alt boyutlar sırası ile mesleki iletişim özerkliği, öğretme süreci özerkliği, öğretim programı özerkliği ve mesleki gelişim özerkliğidir. Öğretmenlerin özerklik davranışları cinsiyet değişkenine göre mesleki gelişim özerkliği ve mesleki iletişim özerkliği alt boyutlarında farklılaşmamaktadır. Öğretme süreci ve öğretim programı özerkliği alt boyutlarında ise anlamlı düzeyde farklılaşmaktadır. Branş değişkenine göre; mesleki iletişim özerkliği boyutu hariç farklılaşmaktadır. Kıdem değişkenine göre; mesleki gelişim ve mesleki iletişim boyutlarında anlamlı farklılık göstermemektedir. Öğretim süreci özerkliği *ve* öğretim programı özerkliği boyutlarında farklılaşmaktadır. Öğretmenler öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışlarını "her zaman" derecesine yakın bir düzeyde gerekli bulmakta, ancak çoğu zaman sergiledikleri görüşündedirler. Öğretmenler özerklik desteği boyutlarını sırası ile duygu ve düşünce desteği, öğrenme süreci desteği ve değerlendirme desteğini gerekli buldukları ve sergiledikleri görüşündedir. Öğretmenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini desteklemesine ilişkin görüşleri cinsiyet ve branş değişkenine göre anlamlı düzeyde farklılaşmaktadır. Kıdem değişkenine göre ise farklılaşmamaktadır.

Regresyon analizi sonuçlarına göre öğretmen özerkliğinin boyutları, öğretmenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme düzeylerinin gereklilik açısından %5'ini, sergileme açısından %12'sini açıklamaktadır. Yordayıcı değişkenlerin öğretmenlerin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme düzeyleri üzerindeki göreli önem sırası gereklilik açısından; mesleki iletişim, öğretme süreci, mesleki gelişim ve öğretim programı özerkliği; sergileme açısından ise öğretme süreci, mesleki iletişim, mesleki gelişim ve öğretim programıdır. Regresyon katsayılarının anlamlılığına ilişkin t-testi sonuçları incelendiğinde yordayıcı değişkenlerden sadece mesleki iletişim değişkeninin öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışının gerekliliği üzerinde anlamlı yordayıcı olduğu; sergileme üzerinde ise mesleki iletişim ve öğretme süreci değişkeninin anlamlı yordayıcı olduğu görülmektedir. Mesleki gelişim ve öğretim programının öğrenen özerkliğini destekleme davranışını sergileme üzerinde anlamlı düzeyde etkili değildir.

Bu araştırmanın Türkiye'de ilk kez yapılmasından dolayı bulgularının çeşitli araştırmalarla karşılaştırılması için farklı örneklem gruplarında başka araştırmalar da yapılması önerilebilir.