

## THE VIEWS OF TEACHERS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS RELATED TO CRITICAL PEDAGOGY PRINCIPLES

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Osman Ferda Beytekin**

*Ege University, İzmir, Türkiye, ferda.beytekin@ege.edu.tr*  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3934-0814>

**Ahmet Burak**

*Ege University, İzmir, Türkiye, ahmetburak3534@gmail.com*  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1024-3981>

### Abstract

The aim of this study is to determine the differentiation rate of the participation of teachers and school administrators in critical pedagogy principles based on some variables. This study is quantitative in nature and designed in a descriptive survey model. The study consists of a total of 660 participants; 550 of which are teachers and 110 school administrators. The data of study has been provided by Izmir National Education Directorate and from randomly picked teachers and school administrators that are working private and state schools in a stratified sampling. As a tool of data gathering, "Critical Pedagogy Principles Scale", developed by Yilmaz (2009), was used. In the scale, there are 3 sub-categories; one of which is "education system", the other is "functions of school" and "liberating school". t-test, ANOVA, Mann-Whitney U Test, Scheffe Test and Kruskal Wallis Tests were used in the analysis of the data. According to the research findings, the participation rate of teachers and school administrators in the principles of critical pedagogy is of medium range. And in the views of participants related to critical pedagogy principles, no significant difference that originated from gender, age, professional seniority and major has been found. In the sub-dimension of "educational system", a significant difference has been found in favour of teachers that graduated from faculty of literature and science. In "liberating school", a significant difference has been found in degree dimension graduate teachers. The school administrators who have 21 years of experience in school administration have shown a relatively lower tendency to participate in pedagogy principles in the "functions of school" category. The teachers who work in private schools have significantly higher attitudes related to pedagogy principles than those who work in state schools.

**Keywords:** Critical Pedagogy, School Administrator, Teacher.

### 1. Introduction

The philosophers of critical pedagogy have composed a different educational language and pedagogical tradition on critical education by combining the views on critical education that they accumulated over the years with the criticism traditions of the school of Frankfurt (Kükürt, 2007). Many critical theorists like Illich Bowles, Gintis, Bourdieu, Apple, Freire, McLaren, Grioux emphasized that there are some errors the idea that education provides a balance between the individuals and distribution of income between them. On the contrary, they found out that the imbalance between each members of the society is re-created in the schools. (Aksoy, Aras, Çankaya and Karakul, 2011). Critical pedagogy, on the other hand,

views education as a political action in order to end the inequality and liberate the oppressed ones (Kincheloe, 2004; McLaren, 1998; Freire, 2013). According to Kanpol (1999), critical pedagogy is a cultural-political device that treats the differences that originate from race, social class and gender factors seriously. Critical pedagogy, in its roots, aims to save the oppressed and unite people under the same language of criticism and solidarity (Kanpol, 1999: 27). Critical pedagogy, prioritizes fairness and equality. It focuses on political side of education. It also stresses the importance of teaching literacy, student and teachers are being researched, opposing the system which restraints and dominates and finally internalizing information by inquiring. Critical pedagogy questions why the truth is only shaped in one specific way and why only one aspect is accepted by the dominating society while other aspects are not. Critical pedagogues should use multiple ways to produce an information about the world and they should know the multiple analysis methods and apply them into their studies.

Freire (2013) suggests that traditional education approach is generally used to ensure social control by having passive students forcefully accept the ruling ideologies by just storing information in their minds without allowing them to question what they are being taught. However, according to how Freire views critical education, students should take active roles in education, name their own experiences in a sociopolitical way and fight the dominant ideologies. He also states that, a new educational approach must be maintained by removing the hierarchic and authoritarian relationship between teachers and students, teachers can become students and students become teachers (Freire, 2013). The fundamental principle in critical pedagogy is that truth and authority and power are always questionable and arguable (Grioux, 2007). Critical pedagogues examine how the schools are teaching the political system that exists in the society and how the students are forced to accept those politic systems and how they should participate in that system and stand up for when the need arises and how they are being raised to maintain it (Ergün, 2009).

Administrators and manifestations of dominant educational approach have been focused under participation, enrichment and democratization aspects instead of analyzing the constructive roots of education in the system (İnal, 2018). In simple terms, critical pedagogy is a liberating school project that goes beyond extracting concessions from capitalist institution (McLaren, 2003).

Critical pedagogy, which was established on social and educational equality ideals, reviews education as a broad part of human services and communal development. Thus, critical approach not only focuses on schooling rate and educational politics but also social fairness and human capacity (İnal 2010). Critical pedagogy fundamentally, concerns itself with social fairness, educational politics, human capacity, and alleviating human related issues. It aims to be a part of making a better society democratically and be a remedy to people whose lives are trouble because of discrimination and poverty (Kincheloe, 2004; İnal, 2010). So, critical pedagogy, aims to eliminate the negativity in education by finding a solution to concepts that all of the educational programs could not resolve over the years such as

inequality in education, democratization and discrimination (Sarigöz and Özkara, 2015).

In traditional education, teachers are seen as the only authority in classrooms whose sole purpose is to transfer their knowledge to students and that is the reason why there is an escalating criticism toward traditional schools (Freire, 2013; Kumaravadivelu 2003). Students should stop being passive and name their experiences in a sociopolitical context. The fact that the educational structure aims to supply the necessary workforce and maintain the political activities of the government caused individuals to lose their identities gave critical approach its significance (Demir, 2012). According to the critical pedagogy, the information that is being taught at schools is biased and not objective, it is shaped and constructed in a certain format. Critical pedagogy, which inclines learners to change the world, purposes itself with re-shaping education by combining intellectual thinking and practicality in schools (Aronowits and Grioux, 1985; Aytumur-Sağiroğlu, 2008).

Critical pedagogy theorists argue that the dominant ideology uses standardized educational programs that prevent students from freely expressing themselves and development of personalities to maintain its existence and protect its own interests (İnal, 2009). Also, critical pedagogues, criticise that education is a tool that is being used by the authority to shape the individuals and the society in their own ideals (Kincheloe, 2008). They imply that education should always take on the side of oppressed and focus on a better life that is based on social fairness, deprivation of exploitation (McLaren, 2003).

To Freire, critical pedagogy techniques aim to remove the hierarchic relationship between teachers and students (Yıldırım, 2011). In the critical pedagogy's perspective schools should be institutions that are able to remove any kinds of discrimination like gender and racism and they should prompt concepts such as social equality and collective reflection (Yıldırım, 2009). That is why the critical pedagogy aims to restructure the intellectual occupations in schools so that thoughts and practices would be combined in education (Aronowitz and Grioux, 1985). According to Grioux (2009) the purpose of critical pedagogy transforming schools in a way that teachers and students can combine theory and practice, actively question social change and gain a common sense.

Critical pedagogy is one of the most important educational approaches currently because its purpose is to remove the hierarchy between teachers and students and liberate individuals (İnal, 2010). Schools in critical pedagogy should be pioneers in reforming and social fairness where the relationship between students and teachers, which is not based on hierarchy rather which includes the healthy communication and dialogues between teachers and students (Yılmaz, 2009). In classes where critical pedagogy is adopted, responsibility and authority are equally shared between teachers and students. Also, in those classes, students embark on the responsibility of learning more than before in traditional ones (Moreno Lopez, 2005). In critical pedagogy, schools should focus on the concepts such as homophobia, racism, class discrimination, sexism, cultural constraint and alienation. Critical pedagogy works on solving these problems and creating conscience and awareness to overcome the inequalities.

Critical pedagogy, questions sociopolitical and historical structures of schools and devices for education to shape the societies (Pennycook, 1999). Critical thinking aims to remove teacher-book based curriculum to create a change in the discriminated conditions of the society (Freire, 2013; Hook 1994; McLaren, 1998). It's philosophical roots come from teachers who are social-cultural and politics-repellent that help improve students' social-cultural liveliness and intelligence. Teachers, in critical pedagogy, study these social and educational dynamics and shape the curriculum around education's macro-information and micro-situations in which the students find themselves while they are exposed to the community. Teachers and school administrators in critical pedagogy are seen as students who study new educational approaches and apply their own insights to support them. These teachers and school administrators motivated in believing in the power of ideals that can reshape the world and humans can be better and the future of humanity depends on these ideals (Groenke and Hatch, 2009). Critical pedagogy offers vision that is fair to those who work in school administration and study in that field. The purposes of critical thinking and critical pedagogy are liberation and an increase of possibilities in the growth of human intelligence in theory and practice. The vital responsibilities to reach these aims, without a doubt, fall to the roles of teachers and schools. That is the reason why teachers should encourage their students to question the truth accepted by everyone in the society (Burbeles and Berk, 1999). The main purpose of critical pedagogy studies is to promote critical thinking in students (Glenn, 2002). However, in order to improve students' critical thinking capabilities, critical pedagogy must take an active role in teaching. That is why it is of utmost importance for school administrators and teachers to have a better understanding of critical pedagogy and believe in its principles.

This research aims to figure out whether the views of teachers and school administrators on critical pedagogy show significant difference based on gender, age, faculty of graduation, professional seniority, their position, administration seniority, educational degree, major and the school level or not.

1. What is the total score of the views of teachers and school administrators' on critical pedagogy in the "education system", the "functions of schools", "liberating school" sub-dimensions?

2. Is there any significant difference in the total score of school administrators and teachers' views on critical pedagogy and do they differentiate based gender, age, faculty of graduation, seniority in being a teacher, duty, administration seniority, level of education and major in the "functions of schools", "liberating school" and "education system" sub-dimensions?

3. Do the views of teachers and school administrators toward critical pedagogy show a significant difference based on school level (anatolian high school, religious high school, science high school) in sub-dimensions of "functions of school", "liberating school", "education system"

4. Do the teachers and school administrators views on critical pedagogy show a significant difference in "functions of school", "liberating school", "education system" sub-dimensions based on the type of schools being private schools or public schools.

## **2. Method**

### **2.1 Research Model**

This research, in which the main purpose is to determine the views of teachers and school administrators on critical pedagogy, uses survey model. In survey model, behaviors and tendencies or insights across population can be described in a quantitative way by using a sampling method that was chosen from a system. (Creswell, 2013). Survey models aim to describe past and future events (Karasar, 2012). Thus, the survey model was found suitable because the main purpose in this research is to figure out teachers' and school administrators' views according to some variables on critical pedagogy.

### **2.2 Study Group**

This study took place in different schools that belong to different educational levels in Izmir city of Bornova, Karşıyaka, Konak and Çiğli provinces. 130 of which is elementary schools, 101 secondary schools, 81 anatolian high schools, 41 vocational high schools, 16 religious vocational high schools and 3 science high schools and their administrators and teachers who worked between 2018 and 2019. Stratified sampling was used as a sampling method. Stratified sampling is a method that makes it possible to determine sub-groups that would represent the characteristics of individuals and show their rates with sampling in the magnitude of the system (Büyüköztürk, Kılıç Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz and Demirel, 2016). And the research consists of 110 school administrators and 550 teachers who work at private and state schools in Izmir city. The research was conducted in 10 of which were elementary schools, 10 were secondary schools, 5 were Anatolian high schools, 5 were vocational high schools, 3 religious vocational high schools, and finally 3 science high schools.

### **2.3 Data Collection Tools**

Data from this research has been collected by using Critical Pedagogy Principles Scale which was devised by Yılmaz (2009). The scale has 31 items and uses a 5 point likert scale which consists of points (1) Strongly Disagree to (5) Strongly Agree. The scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions which are "Education System, Functions of School, Liberating school". 15 items belong to "Education System" sub-dimension, 11 items are related to "Functions of School" and lastly 5 items belong to "Liberating school" sub-dimension in the scale. However, some of the items in the scale (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 22) reverse coded. Participants whose score is higher have a better understanding of critical pedagogy and the participants with lower scores have lower understanding. In the original version of the scale the Alpha Cronbach reliability coefficient for the whole scale is 0,75; for education system sub-dimension, 0,88; for functions of school, 0,78; and for the liberating school sub-dimension, 0,66 (Yılmaz 2009). In this research, Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found out to be 0,74 for the whole scale; 0,77 for the education system; 0,53 for the functions of school; and 0,69 for the liberating school sub-dimensions.

### **2.4 Analysis of The Data**

In the study,  $\bar{x}$ ,  $ss$  and  $Sh$  values have been used to describe the total score in the scale and descriptive frequencies and percentages were used in order to show the demographic characteristics of the participants. Statistical parametric values were used for groups which show normal distribution

tendencies. However, for the groups that do not show normal distribution, non-parametric techniques were used. Also, independent Group 1 test was used for variables that have two categories and show a normal distribution. Finally, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) method was used for groups that have 3 categories and show normal distribution. Complementary Scheffe Test was used to figure out the sources of variations. However non-parametric Kruskal Wallis-H test was used for the data which is not parametric and Mann Whitney U test was used to describe the sources of differences, when the results showed significant difference.

### 3. Findings

The data gathered in this research has been shown in tables by reviewing their sequences based on independent variables. Though, no data has been shown on teacher and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy principles based on gender, age, professional seniority or major because there has been no significant difference based on these variables.

#### 3.1. General ideas of school administrators and teachers on critical pedagogy principles

Teachers and school administrators' general insights on critical pedagogy has been analyzed in 3 sub-dimensions. And arithmetic averages, standard deviations and standard errors has been given in these three sub-dimensions in Table 1.

**Table 1.** General insights of teachers and school administrators on critical pedagogy principles

| Critical Pedagogy Principles Scale Sub-dimensions | N   | $\bar{x}$ | ss   | Sh <sub>x</sub> |
|---|-----|-----------|------|-----------------|
| Education System                                  | 660 | 3,12      | 0,53 | 0,02            |
| Functions of School                               | 660 | 3,11      | 0,44 | 0,01            |
| Liberating school                                 | 660 | 2,74      | 0,48 | 0,01            |
| Total   | 660 | 3,05      | 0,46 | 0,01            |

As it is visible in the Table 1 above, views of teachers and school administrators on critical pedagogy are in a medium level in education system ( $\bar{x}$ =3.12), functions of school ( $\bar{x}$  =3.11) and liberating school ( $\bar{x}$ =2.74) sub-dimensions.

#### 3.2 Teachers and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy principles based on the faculty of graduation variable

In order to compare the values of teachers and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy, one way analysis of variables (ANOVA) test was held and the findings were shown in Table 2.

**Table 2.** ANOVA test on views of school administrators and teachers' views on critical pedagogy principles based on the faculty of graduation variable.

| Sub Dimension    | Faculty                         | N        | $\bar{x}$ | SS         | Var. K.     | KT      | Sd  | KO   | F       | P    |
|------------------|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|-------------|---------|-----|------|---------|------|
| Education System | Education                       | 377      | 3,11      | 0,56       | Inter-group | 1,862   | 2   | ,931 |         |      |
|                  | Faculty Science and Literacy F. | 199      | 3,19      | 0,50       | Intra-group | 187,841 | 656 | ,286 | 3,252** | ,039 |
|                  | Other Faculties                 | 84       | 3,01      | 0,46       | Total       | 189,703 | 658 |      |         |      |
|                  | Total                           | 660      | 3,12      | 0,53       |             |         |     |      |         |      |
| * p<.05          |                                 | ** p<.01 |           | *** p<.001 |             |         |     |      |         |      |

According to the results of the analysis, there has been no significant difference in functions of school, and liberating school sub-dimensions. However, there is a significant difference based on the faculty of graduation in education system sub-dimension ( $F=3,252$ ;  $p<.05$ ). To find out between which groups the significant difference took place, Scheffe Multiple Comparison Technique was used and the results from the test were given in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Scheffe Test for in which groups the views of school administrators and teachers on critical pedagogy principles in education system sub-dimension based on their faculties of graduation.

| Faculty (i)                     | Faculty (j)                    | $\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$ | $Sh_{\bar{x}}$ | p          |  |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|------------|--|
| Faculty of Education            | Sci-. Literature.              | -,07401                 | ,04689         | ,288       |  |
|                                 | Other                          | ,10028                  | ,06488         | ,304       |  |
| Faculty of Science and Literacy | Faulty Of Edu.                 | ,07401                  | ,04689         | ,288       |  |
|                                 | Other                          | ,17429*                 | ,06992         | ,045       |  |
| Other Faculties                 | Faculty of Edu.                | -,10028                 | ,06488         | ,304       |  |
|                                 | Faculty of Sci, and Literature | -,17429*                | ,06992         | ,045       |  |
| * p<.05                         |                                | ** p<.01                |                | *** p<.001 |  |

In table 3 results from Scheffe test show a significant difference between faculty of science and literature and the other faculties ( $p<.05$ ) in education system sub-dimension based on the faculties of graduation. This result means that school administrators and teachers who graduated from faculty of science and literature have more positive views on critical pedagogy principles. Still, when Scheffe Test findings were analyzed, the difference between other groups was not significant.

### 3.3 Teachers' and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy principles based on their duties in school.

An independent Group t Test was used to describe the value of the significant difference between teachers and school administrators on critical pedagogy principles based on their position.

**Table 4.** Teachers and school administrators views on critical pedagogy principles

| Sub-dimension       | Duty          | n   | $\bar{x}$ | SS   | Sh $\bar{x}$ | t Test |       |      |
|---------------------|---------------|-----|-----------|------|--------------|--------|-------|------|
|                     |               |     |           |      |              | Sd     | t     | P    |
| Education System    | School Admin. | 110 | 3,46      | 0,59 | 0,05         | 658    | 1,421 | ,043 |
|                     | Teacher       | 550 | 3,12      | 0,52 | 0,02         |        |       |      |
| Functions of School | School Admin. | 110 | 3,09      | 0,44 | 0,04         | 658    | -,515 | ,663 |
|                     | Teacher       | 550 | 3,11      | 0,44 | 0,01         |        |       |      |
| Liberating school   | School Admin. | 110 | 2,80      | 0,52 | 0,05         | 658    | 1,315 | ,193 |
|                     | Teacher       | 550 | 2,73      | 0,47 | 0,02         |        |       |      |
| Total               | School Admin  | 110 | 9,07      | 1,03 | 0,09         | 658    | ,885  | ,913 |
|                     | Teacher       | 550 | 8,97      | 1,04 | 0,04         |        |       |      |

As it can be seen in Table 4, Critical Pedagogy Scale total and all of the sub-dimensions arithmetical averages which are the results of Independent Group t Test show that school administrators and teachers views on critical pedagogy principles differ significantly depending on their duties in the school in education system sub-dimension ( $p < .050$ ;  $t = 1,421$ ). According to these findings school administrators' scores are higher than teachers' in education education system sub-dimension. However no significant statistical differences were found in their views on critical pedagogy principles under liberating school and functions of school sub-dimensions ( $p > .050$ ). In other words, the total score of pedagogy principles belonging to school administrators and teachers do not change in liberating school and functions of school sub-dimensions.

### 3.4 Teachers' and School Administrators views on critical pedagogy principles in professional seniority variable.

Nonparametric Kruskal Wallis-H test was applied to compare how the views of teachers and school administrators views on critical pedagogy principles changed based on professional seniority variable and the results were given in Table 5 below.

**Table 5.** Views of school administrators and teachers on critical pedagogy principles according to professional seniority variable in functions of school sub-dimension.

| Sub-dimension       | Administration Seniority | n  | $\bar{x}$ sequence | $x^2$  | sd | p     |
|---------------------|--------------------------|----|--------------------|--------|----|-------|
| Functions of School | 1-5 years                | 59 | 62,36              |        |    |       |
|                     | 6-10 years               | 15 | 65,60              |        |    |       |
|                     | 11-15 years              | 8  | 59,69              |        |    |       |
|                     | 16-20 years              | 15 | 64,63              | 14,189 | 4  | ,007* |
|                     | 21 years and above       | 18 | 31,11              |        |    |       |
|                     | Total                    |    | 115                |        |    |       |

\*  $p < .05$       \*\*  $p < .01$       \*\*\*  $p < .001$

As the results show, a significant difference was found in functions of school sub-dimension based on seniority of administration. However, the same can not be mentioned for the other sub-dimensions. The results of analysis of the changes in the functions of schools are given in the Table 5.

When the Table 5 examined, there has been a significant difference found in the scores from groups of different seniority levels according to the results from Kruskal Wallis-H Test which was used to find out whether Critical Pedagogy Scale score averages differed significantly in functions of school sub-dimension based on seniority in administration variables ( $\chi^2=14,189$ ;  $p<.05$ ). To find out the source of this difference, Mann Whitney U test was used as a complimentary test and the results from it shows that a significant difference between the groups of administration seniority 1-5 years and 21 years and above, ( $U=230,500$ ;  $Z=-3,628$ ,  $P<.001$ ) in favor of 1-5 years, between 6-10 years and 21 years ( $U=58,000$ ;  $Z=-2,799$ ,  $P<.010$ ), in favor of 6-10 years, between the groups 11-15 years and 21 years and above ( $U=35,000$ ;  $Z=-2,065$ ,  $P<.050$ ), in favor of 11-15 years, and lastly between 16-20 and 21 and above ( $U=65,500$ ;  $Z=-2,523$ ,  $P<.050$ ), in favor of 16-20 years has been found. All these differences show that teachers with 21 years and above professional seniority show less tendency to participate in critical pedagogy principles than teachers with less professional seniority years. Teachers who did not have any experience in administration have been excluded from this test.

### 3.5 School administrators' and teachers' views on critical pedagogy principles based on level of education variable

Non-parametric Kuskal Wallis-H test was used to determine the changes on the views of teachers and school administrators related to principles of critical pedagogy based on the level of education variable and the results were shown in Table 6, 7 and 8.

**Table 6.** School administrators' and teachers views on critical pedagogy principles in the Kruskal Wallis-H Test in total values based on level of education variable.

| Dimension | Level of Education | N   | $\bar{x}_{sequence}$ | $\chi^2$ | <i>sd</i> | <i>p</i> |
|-----------|--------------------|-----|----------------------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Total     | Bachelor           | 543 | 321,61               | 7,152    | 2         | ,028*    |
|           | Master Degree      | 103 | 376,04               |          |           |          |
|           | Doctor's Degree    | 14  | 316,14               |          |           |          |
|           | Total              | 660 |                      |          |           |          |

\*  $p<.05$       \*\*  $p<.01$       \*\*\*  $p<.001$

In the table 6, the results, which were taken from the Kruskal Wallis-H test which was used to figure out whether teachers' and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy principles showed any significant difference or not based on level of education variables, indicate that there is indeed a significant difference between the different levels of education and their average values ( $\chi^2=7,152$ ;  $p<.050$ ). To find out the source of the difference Mann Whitney U Test was used and the results from the test show that there is a significant difference between the groups who had bachelor's degree and master's degree in favor of the group who had master's degree ( $U=232,000$ ;  $Z=-2,677$ ,  $P<.050$ ). It is possible to claim that teachers who have master's degree have a more positive view on critical pedagogy principles than the teachers who have bachelor's degree. There hasn't been any significant difference found between the other level of education groups ( $p>.050$ ).

**Table 7.** Kruskal Wallis-H test of teachers' and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy principles in the functions of school sub-dimension based on the level of education variable.

| <i>Sub-dimension</i> | Level of Education | N   | $\bar{x}$ sequence | $x^2$ | <i>sd</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Functions of Schools | Bachelor's Degree  | 543 | 321,11             | 9,327 | 2         | ,009*    |
|                      | Master's Degree    | 103 | 382,94             |       |           |          |
|                      | Doctor's Degree    | 14  | 308,89             |       |           |          |
|                      | Total              | 660 |                    |       |           |          |

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$     \*\*\*  $p < .001$

When the results from Kruskal Wallis-H Test which was used to investigate whether there is a difference between the average values of groups belonging to different levels of education or not examined, a significant difference in functions of school sub-dimension between those groups was found statistically ( $x^2=9,327$ ;  $p < .050$ ). To find the source of the difference, Mann Whitney U test was used as a complimentary and it's results indicate that a significant change was found between the bachelor and master's degree level in favor of the group that is of master's degree ( $U=22230,500$ ;  $Z=-3,032$ ,  $P < .050$ ). According to these results, the teachers who have a master's degree have more positive attitudes toward the principles of critical pedagogy. However no significant differences were found among the other groups ( $p > .050$ ).

**Table 8.** Wallis-H Test results of the views of teachers and school administrators' on critical pedagogy based on level of education variable in liberating school sub-dimension

| <i>Sub-dimension</i> | Level of Education | N   | $\bar{x}$ sequence | $x^2$ | <i>sd</i> | <i>p</i> |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Liberating school    | Bachelor's Degree  | 543 | 322,16             | 7,128 | 2         | ,028     |
|                      | Master's Degree    | 103 | 362,37             |       |           |          |
|                      | Doctor's Degree    | 14  | 419,57             |       |           |          |
|                      | Total              | 660 |                    |       |           |          |

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$     \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Results in table 8 that were taken using Kruskal Wallis-H test that was used in finding out whether there are statistically significant difference between the groups of different levels of education ( $x^2=7,128$ ;  $p < .050$ ). Mann Whitney U was used as a complimentary test and the data shows that there is a significant difference between teachers who have bachelor's degree and teachers who have master's degree in favor of the ones with the master's degree ( $U=24553,000$ ;  $Z=-1,987$ ,  $P < .050$ ). These findings point out that teachers with master's degree are more positive towards critical pedagogy principles than the teachers with bachelor's degree. Though, there hasn't been any significant different between the other groups ( $p > .050$ ).

### **3.6. Teachers' and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy based on school level variable**

One way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the values of teachers and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy principles and the results were given in Table 9.

**Table 9.** ANOVA Test results of school administrators and teacher's views on critical pedagogy principles based on school level variable in education system sub-dimension

| <i>Sub Dimension</i>    | School Level                     | <i>N</i> | $\bar{x}$ | <i>SS</i> | Var. K.     | <i>KT</i> | <i>Sd</i> | <i>KO</i> | <i>F</i> | <i>P</i> |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| <i>Education System</i> | Elementary                       | 199      | 3,09      | 0,55      | Inter-group | 3,280     | 5         | ,656      |          |          |
|                         | Secondary                        | 103      | 3,12      | 0,46      | Intra-group | 186,424   | 653       | ,285      |          |          |
|                         | Religious Vocational high school | 62       | 3,21      | 0,48      | Total       | 189,703   | 658       |           | 2,298    | ,044     |
|                         | Science high school              | 64       | 3,23      | 0,57      |             |           |           |           |          |          |
|                         | Anatolian high school            | 117      | 3,01      | 0,59      |             |           |           |           |          |          |
|                         | Vocational high school           | 115      | 3,18      | 0,48      |             |           |           |           |          |          |
|                         | Total                            | 660      | 3,12      | 0,53      |             |           |           |           |          |          |
|                         |                                  |          |           |           |             |           |           |           |          |          |

\*  $p < .05$       \*\*  $p < .01$       \*\*\*  $p < .001$

When the Table 9 is analyzed, as a result of the One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) which was used to find out whether there is a significant difference between the views of teachers and school administrators on critical pedagogy based on school level variable in education system sub-dimension and a significant difference has been found between the groups of different school levels ( $F=2,298$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Scheffe Multiple Comparison Test was used as a complimentary test to in which sub-dimension based on school levels variable is the source of the difference is and the results show that the difference is accidental. However, when the results from different school levels were analyzed the most positive thinking out of all the level groups belonged to teachers who worked in science high schools and minimum value belonged to Anatolian high school teachers.

### **3.7. The views of school administrators and teachers on critical pedagogy principles based on types of schools**

Independent Group t Test was used to determine the school administrators and teachers' views on critical pedagogy principles on school type variable and the results were given in Table 10.

**Table 10:** The views of school administrators and teachers on the principles of critical pedagogy based on school type variable.

| Dimension           | School Type     | n   | $\bar{x}$ | SS   | Sh $_{\bar{x}}$ | t Test |        |      |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----|-----------|------|-----------------|--------|--------|------|
|                     |                 |     |           |      |                 | Sd     | t      | P    |
| Total               | State Schools   | 583 | 8,94      | 1,04 | 0,04            | 658    | -3,241 | ,001 |
|                     | Private Schools | 76  | 9,35      | 0,94 | 0,10            |        |        |      |
| Education System    | State Schools   | 583 | 3,11      | 0,53 | 0,02            | 658    | -2,209 | ,029 |
|                     | Private Schools | 76  | 3,25      | 0,51 | 0,05            |        |        |      |
| Functions of School | State Schools   | 584 | 3,10      | 0,43 | 0,01            | 658    | -2,178 | ,030 |
|                     | Private Schools | 76  | 3,22      | 0,48 | 0,05            |        |        |      |
| Liberating schools  | State Schools   | 584 | 2,72      | 0,49 | 0,02            | 658    | -2,520 | ,012 |
|                     | Private Schools | 76  | 2,87      | 0,43 | 0,05            |        |        |      |

\* p&lt;.05

\*\* p&lt;.01

\*\*\* p&lt;.001

Results in the table are taken from Independent Group t Test which was used in order to find out how the views of teachers and administrators' on the principles of critical pedagogy differed and they point out that a significant difference was found between state and private school teachers which was in favor of private school teachers ( $p<.050$ ), meaning that the teachers who work in private schools gave more positive feedback towards critical pedagogy principles than the teachers who work in state schools.

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusion

In this research, school administrators' and teachers' views on critical pedagogy principles based on their ages, genders, their faculties of graduation, professional seniority, duties in school, seniority in administration, major, level and types of school variables were analyzed. In the research, the participation rate of school administrators were found out to be of medium range. Yılmaz and Altinkurt (2011), Taşgın and Küçükoğlu (2014), Terzi, Şahan, Çelik and Zöğ (2015) also found similar participation rates in their researches. The least participation rate of teachers and school administrators was found in liberating school sub-dimension. And the researches of Terzi and others (2015) and Büyükgöze and Yılmaz Fındık (2018) support this finding. However in the studies by Yılmaz and Altinkurt (2011), Taşgın and Küçükoğlu (2014), Şahin, Demir, Arcagök (2016) show that the least participation was found in education system sub-dimension. The purpose of critical pedagogy is to educate and liberate any and every person regardless of their race, class, gender (Vandrick, 1994). Critical pedagogy and its supporters claim that education can help students develop liberating awareness, notice the disposition in authority and establish a relationship between skill and strength (Grioux, 2004). Young population should be critical thinkers and citizens who question in the current situation in which the population became consumers because of the marketing logic (Giroux, 2009).

Also, no significant difference has been found based on gender of teachers and school administrators. This result overlaps with the research Yılmaz (2009) held on the teachers who worked in elementary schools and the research that Sarigöz and Özkara (2015) held on pre-service teachers. The results from the research held by Aslan and Kozikoğlu, on the other hand, show that male teachers significantly participate in the principles of critical pedagogy more than the female teachers. In the researches where the Iranian teachers' of critical pedagogy were analyzed by Aliakbari and Allahmoradi (2012), they found a significant difference in favor of male teachers and they explained this fact by male individuals have more rights in independence and expressing themselves than female.

Although when the results of the teachers' and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy are analyzed, a significant difference in education system sub-dimension in favor of the ones who graduated from faculty of science and literature. The views on critical pedagogy of the teachers participated in this research showed no significant difference in seniority variable. However in different studies, Yılmaz (2009) with Büyükgöze and Yılmaz Fındık (2018) suggest that new teachers who just started working showed more positive attitudes toward critical pedagogy than those who worked for longer periods of time. The reason for this difference might be that teachers who just graduated from a university have more idealistic thoughts and later on these thoughts gradually decrease with passing time based on culture, environment and interactions with other teachers at schools.

In this research, no significant difference has been found between the participants' views on critical pedagogy based on duties at school variable. In addition, no significant difference has been found in functions of school and liberating school sub-dimensions either. However there is a significant difference in functions of school sub-dimension based on seniority variable. administrators who worked 21 years or above participated less in critical pedagogy principles than individuals who have less experience in administration. Reason to this fact might be because critical perspectives of teachers gradually decrease over the years as they gain more experience.

Research results also show that a significant difference has been found based on level of education variable. Teachers and administrators who have master's degree have more positive views on critical pedagogy and its principles than those who have bachelor's degree. A similar difference can be seen in functions of school and liberating school sub-dimensions. However, no significant difference has been found based on this variable in education system. Yılmaz (2009) with Büyükgöze and Yılmaz Fındık (2018) indicate in their studies that participation significantly differentiated in favor of teachers with master's degree.

The views of the participants on critical pedagogy principles showed no significant difference in major variable. On the contrary, studies by Sarigöz and Özkara (2015) and Kökdemir (2003) describe that there is a significant difference in participation rates in critical pedagogy principles related to their major. This might be originated from the lectures and the professors they had at the universities.

No significant difference in total value has been shown related to the views of teachers and administrators on critical pedagogy in functions of

school and liberating school sub-dimensions. Still, significant difference has been found in the education system sub-dimension. The highest participation rate in education sub-dimension belong to science high schools and the lowest rate belongs to Anatolian high schools. In the study, the views of teachers on critical pedagogy principles differentiated significantly based on school type. Teachers and administrators who work in private schools participated in the principles of critical pedagogy more than the teachers who work in state schools. A similar difference has been found in education system sub-dimension based on functions of school and liberating school sub-dimensions. The reason might be because private schools have more opportunities to choose teachers who adopt critical pedagogy than state schools.

The fact that teachers and school administrators have medium values of participation in critical pedagogy principles means that they have accepted critical pedagogy only partially. Thus, it is important to create an environment of freely expression of ideas, critical thinking, social fairness starting from teachers. Therefore teacher candidates should be given lectures on critical thinking, social fairness, equality and democracy. The significant difference rates of teachers' and school administrators' views on critical pedagogy principles are in the favor of school administrators. So, the school administrators may hold seminars for the teachers at their schools about critical pedagogy approaches. Also, the school administrators could give a reflective training to the teachers where they can share their insights about critical pedagogy.

### References

- Aksoy, H. H., Aras, H. Ö., Çankaya, D. & Karakul, A. K. (2011). Eğitimde nitelik: Eğitim ekonomisi kuramlarının eğitimin niteliğine ilişkin kurgusunun eleştirel analizi. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum*, 9(33), 60-99.
- Aliakbari, M & Allahmoradi, N. (2012). On Iranian School Teachers' Perceptions of the Principles of Critical Pedagogy. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*. 4(1), 154-171.
- Aronowitz, S. & H. A. Giroux (1985). *Education under siege: the conservative, liberal, and radical debate over schooling*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Aslan, H.(2012). *Gelecekçi sanat eğitimi modellerine temel oluşturması bakımından görsel okuryazarlık ve eleştirel pedagoji ilişkisi* ( Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi). Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi, Samsun.
- Aslan, M. & Kozikoğlu, İ. (2015). Pedagojik formasyon eğitimi alan öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel pedagojiye ilişkin görüşleri. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(1), 1-14.
- Aytemur-Sağiroğlu, N. (2008). Özgürleştirici bir eğitim arayışı: Eleştirel pedagoji okulu. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi*, 6(24), 50-61.
- Bercaw, L. A. & Stooksberry, L. M. (2004). Teacher education, critical pedagogy, and standards: an exploration of theory and practice. *Essays in Education*, 12.
- <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/2197/99e844fe1b134de716ef470598f26e620ba6.pdf> adresinden alınmıştır. Erişim Tarihi: 29 Kasım 2018.

Burbeles, N. C. & Berk, R. (1999). *Critical thinking and critical pedagogy: Relations, differences, and limits*. New York: Routledge.

Büyükgoze, H. & Yılmaz Fındık, L. (2018). Eleştirel pedagojinin eğitim sistemindeki görünümü: Öğretmenler üzerine bir çalışma. *İlköğretim Online*, 17(3), 1336-1352. <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr> adresinden alınmıştır. Erişim Tarihi: 30 Kasım 2018. doi 10.17051/ilkonline.2018.466355

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç-Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö. A., Karadeniz, Ş. ve Demirel, F. (2016). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). Nicel Yöntemler (Çev. Bursal, M.). *Araştırma Deseni* içinde (ss. 155- 182). Ankara: Eğiten Kitap.

Demir, H. (2012). *Eleştirel teori ve sosyo-kültürel bileşkenler ekseninde eleştirel sanat pedagojisi* (Yayınlanmış yüksek lisans tezi). Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim, Samsun.

Demirtaş, H. & Özer N. (2015). Eleştirel kuram açısından eğitim ve eğitim yönetimi. *Journal of Teacher Education and Educators* 2(4), 206-227.

Ergün, M. (2009). *Eğitim felsefesi*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Freire, P. (2009). Dönüşümün riskleri ve hissettirdiği korkular. *Eleştirel pedagoji söyleşileri* (Çev. Babaoğlu, E. Ç.). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları

Freire, P. (2000). *Yüreğin pedagojisi* (Çev. Orhangazi, Ö.). Ankara: Ütopya Yayınları.

Freire, P. (2013). *Ezilenlerin pedagojisi* (Çev. Hattatoğlu, D. & Özbek, E.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). Critical pedagogy and the postmodern/modern divide: Towards a pedagogy of democratization. *Teacher Education Quarterly*(Winter), 31-47.

Giroux, H. A. (2007). Introduction: Democracy, education, and the politics of critical pedagogy. In P. McLaren & J. L. Kincheloe, *Critical pedagogy: Where are we now?* (pp. 1-5). New York, NY: Peter Lang

Giroux, H. A. (2009). Dil/kültürel incelemeler alanında eleştirel pedagojinin bir rolü var mıdır? *Eleştirel pedagoji söyleşileri* (Çev. Babaoğlu, E. Ç.). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.

Glenn, C. B. (2002). Critical rhetoric and pedagogy: (Re)considering student-centered dialogue. *Radical Pedagogy*, 4 (1).

Groenke, S. L. & Hatch, J. A. (2009). *Critical pedagogy and teacher education in the neoliberal era*. Los Angeles: Springer Science Business Media.

Hook, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge. doi: 10.4324/9780203700280

İnal, K. (2009). Eleştirel Pedagoji: Ezilenler için eğitim. *Eleştirel Pedagoji Politik Eğitim Dergisi*, 1, 2-10.

İnal, K. (2010). Eleştirel pedagoji: Eğitim(d)e modern özgürleştirici bir yaklaşım. *Alternatif Eğitim e-Dergisi*, 1, 14-23.

İnal, K. (2018). Eleştirel pedagojinin eleştirisi. İçinde J.L. Kincheloe (Ed.), *Eleştirel Pedagoji* (ss.17-38). İstanbul: Yeni İnsan Yayınevi

Kanpol, B. (1999). *Critical pedagogy: An introduction*. USA: Greenwood Publishing Group

Karasar, N. (2012). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Kesik, F. & Aksu, A. (2015). Eleştirel kuram perspektifinden eğitim denetimine ilişkin bir değerlendirme. *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 12(1), 811-830. doi: 10.14687/ijhs.v12i1.3081.

Kesik, F. & Bayram, A. (2015). Eğitim sisteminin eleştirel pedagoji perspektifinden değerlendirilmesi. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 11(3), 900-921.

Kesik, F. (2014). Eğitim yönetiminde çoğul bir ses: Eleştirel kuram. *Kalem Eğitim ve İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 4(2), 93-133.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2004). The knowledges of teacher education: developing a critical complex epistemology. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31 (1), 49-66.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2008). Critical pedagogy and the knowledge wars of the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 1(1), 1-22.

Korkmaz, Ö.(2009). Öğretmenlerin eleştirel düşünme eğilim ve düzeyleri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(1), 1-13.

Kozikoğlu, İ. & Erden, R. Z. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının eğitim felsefesi inançları ile eleştirel pedagojiye ilişkin görüşleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *İlköğretim Online*, 2018; 17(3), 1566-1582. <http://ilkogretim-online.org.tr> adresinden alınmıştır. Erişim Tarihi: 30 Kasım 2018.

Kökdemir, D. (2003). *Belirsizlik durumlarında karar verme ve problem çözme* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macro strategies for language teaching*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Kükürt, R.O. (2007). Özne Sorunu Açısından Eğiten-Eğitilen İlişkisi. 16. *Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Bildirisi*. 5-7 Eylül 2007. Tokat: Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi.

McLaren, P. (1998). Revolutionary pedagogy in post-revolutionary times: Rethinking the political economy of critical education. *Educational Theory*, 48(4), 431-462. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-5446.1998.00431.x

McLaren, P. (2003a). Critical pedagogy: A look at the major concepts. In, A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (68-96). New York & London: Routledge Falmer.

McLaren, P. (2003b). Revolutionary pedagogy in Post-Revolutionary times: Rethinking the political economy of critical education. In, A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. D. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (151-184). New York & London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Moreno-Lopez, I. (2005). Sharing Power with Students: The Critical Language Classroom. *Radical Pedagogy: An Interdisciplinary. Peer-Reviewed Journal Devoted to the Analysis of Teaching and Learning*, 7(2).

Peca, K. (2000). *Critical theory in education: Philosophical, research, sociobehavioural, and organizational assumptions*. Portales, New Mexico: Eastern New Mexico University. [ERIC Number: ED 450057].

Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329-348. doi: 10.2307/3587668.

Sarıgöz, O. & Özkara, Y. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel pedagoji ve ilkeleri hakkında görüşlerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 8(39), 710-716.

Spring J. (2010). *Özgür eğitim* (Çev. Ekmekçi, A.). İstanbul: Ayrıntı Yayınları.

Şahin, Ç., Demir, M. K., & Arcagök, S. (2016). Öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel pedagoji ilkelerine yönelik yaklaşımlarının çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Erzincan Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(2), 1187-1205.

Taşgın, A., & Küçüköğlü, A. (2014). Öğretmen adayı perspektifinden eleştirel pedagoji (Atatürk Üniversitesi örneği). *XIII. Ulusal Sınıf Öğretmenliği Eğitimi Sempozyumu*. 29-31 Mayıs 2014. Kütahya: Dumlupınar Üniversitesi.

Terzi, A. R., Şahan, H. H., Çelik, H., & Zöğ, H. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının epistemolojik inançları ile eleştirel pedagoji ilkeleri arasındaki ilişki. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 4(1), 344-356.

Vandrick, S. (1994). *Feminist Pedagogy and ESL*. *College ESL*, 4(2), 69-92.

Yıldırım, A. (2009, Mart). *Diyalog temelli eğitim anlayışında Paulo Freire örneği*.

[https://www.academia.edu/1250691/Diyalog\\_Temelli\\_E%C4%9Fitim\\_Anlay%C4%B1%C5%9F%C4%B1nda\\_Paulo\\_Freire\\_%C3%96rne%C4%9Fi](https://www.academia.edu/1250691/Diyalog_Temelli_E%C4%9Fitim_Anlay%C4%B1%C5%9F%C4%B1nda_Paulo_Freire_%C3%96rne%C4%9Fi) adresinden elde edilmiştir. Erişim Tarihi: 5 Temmuz 2018.

Yıldırım, A. (2011). *Eleştirel pedagoji Paulo Freire ve Ivan Illich'in eğitim anlayışı üzerine*. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Yılmaz, K. & Altınkurt, Y. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel pedagoji ile ilgili görüşleri. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 12(3), 195-213.

Yılmaz, K. (2009). Elementary school teachers' views about the critical pedagogy. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 18(1), 139-149.