

COMPARATIVE INVESTIGATION OF DEMOCRATIC VALUES OF GIFTED AND NORMAL INTELLIGENCE STUDENTS

Kubilay YAZICI

*Prof. Dr., Nigde Ömer Halisdemir University, Faculty of Education, kyazici@ohu.edu.tr
ORCID: 0000-0002-6057-8192*

Tuğçe Gamze İŞÇİ

*PhD Student, Nigde Ömer Halisdemir University Graduate School of Educational Sciences,
tugcegamzeisci@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-0287-9886*

İsa ALIÇ

*Principal, Nigde Akşemseddin Science and Art Center, isa.alic@hotmail.com
ORCID:0000-0001-7405-2960*

Received: 21.05.2019 Accepted: 03.10.2019

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to comparatively investigate the democratic values of the gifted students and students with normal intelligence in terms of gender, family income level and grade level. In this research, causal comparison model, one of the quantitative research methods, was used. The study group of the study consisted of 192 secondary school students receiving supportive education in three selected Science and Art Centers with easily accessible sampling and secondary school students studying in three public schools. The data were collected through the 'Democratic Values Scale' developed by İlğan, Karayığit & Çetin (2013). According to the findings of the study, a significant difference was found in favour of female students studying in both school types. While there was no significant difference between the grade levels and democratic values of students in SAC, there was a significant difference in favour of 5th grade in the state schools. As for the family income levels, it was revealed that there was a direct correlation between family income levels and students' democratic values in both school types. The findings are discussed within the literature and various recommendations are made in accordance with the results of the study.

Keywords: Gifted students, democratic value, science and art center, secondary school

INTRODUCTION

Several views have been put forward as to what democracy is from past to present or what should be included in the concept of democracy. As Ertürk (1981) states in its most general discourse, democracy is a philosophy of life and a way of living. Since democracy is a system of values, the main way to achieve democratization in a society is to train individuals who have adopted democracy as a way of life (Oktay, 2001). Learning and adopting the principles and requirements of democracy are closely related to knowing democratic values. According to İlhan et al. (2013), the existence of individuals who really possess democratic values and whose lives are based on these values is important in forming a society.

Democracy can attain a healthy structure only when democratic values seep into society. In order to achieve this goal, it is important to internalize the basic values such as equality, justice, freedom, sovereignty and respect for human beings that constitute the essence of democracy (Büyükdüvenci, 1990; Kurnaz, Çiftci & Karapazar, 2013, MacMath, 2008; Subba, 2014). The perspective of democracy in a society also reveals the importance that culture attaches to democratic values (İbret, Recepoğlu, Avcı & Recepoğlu, 2018). To put it briefly, democratic value is defined as the basic values that individuals should possess in order to ensure the desired result of democracy (Selvi, 2006; Shechtman, 2002).

In this context, there is a mutual relationship between democracy and education. Democracy is strengthened and sustained through education. Similarly, education can serve the desired purpose if it is taken in a democratic environment where the basic features of democracy are assimilated (Karakütük, 2001; Moss & Dahlberg, 2008). Education; on one hand, the existence of democracy is the basic condition for the adoption by the society; on the other, democracy is important for increasing the quality expected from education and for the individuals who grow up to benefit both themselves and humanity (Karadağ, Baloğlu & Yaçınkayalar, 2006 cited from Yeşil, 2002). Learning environments in schools should be organized in such a way that they can guide democratic student behaviors, facilitate learning and serve individual differences and needs (Oğuz, 2011).

The fact that schools function as an institution constituting and shaping the social structure plays an important role in the stage of students' adaptation to the social structure as democratic citizens. This situation contributes to the development of students' awareness of democracy and the institutionalization of democracy culture within the social structure. In order to develop a culture of democracy in social life, individuals who are conscious of democracy should be raised (Özdaş, Ekinci & Bindak, 2014). At this stage, one of the concepts related to the adaptation process of the individual to the current situation can be expressed as intelligence. Intelligence is defined as an individual's ability to adapt to new situations and new problems.

The intelligent individual is the person who can find several possible solutions required by the situation, review them and choose the most appropriate one (Freeman, 2001; Freeman, Raffan & Warwick, 2010; Özgüven, 1994; Renzulli, 2012). It can be stated that the intelligence levels of the individuals forming the society should be taken

into consideration in order to realize the adaptation process of the individual to the social structure in the democratic life in a healthy way.

There are a good number of different definitions as to who a gifted child is. While Çetinkaya (2013) defines giftedness as “a combination of creative talent and creative responsibility and above average talent in several of the mental abilities”, a special talented person is defined by the Ministry of National Education [MNE] (2006) as a person who performs at a high level in intelligence, creativity, art, leadership capacity, motivation and special fields compared to his/her peers.

Gifted children have different developmental, physical and mental characteristics compared to their peers with normal intelligence (Özbay & Palancı, 2011). In addition to the education of gifted children with their normally developing peers, the fact that they have innate and different qualities differing from their peers also necessitates special education. Because gifted individuals, who differ especially mentally as well as socially and morally, exhibit unique characteristics in these fields.

The concepts of democratic attitude, rights and freedoms, equality and tolerance are among the unique concepts of gifted and talented individuals (Akarsu, 2004; Çetinkaya, 2013; Davaslıgil, 2004; Gross, 1998; Renzulli, 1999). For the purposes of democratic education, individuals are expected to be independent and egalitarian in their country and in the world. Gifted and talented individuals are thought to be able to serve these purposes more than other individuals due to their ability to think about this subject in detail with their mental capacities and their respect to democracy concepts such as equality and personal rights (Çetinkaya & Kınca, 2015).

In this study, it is aimed to compare the levels of possessing democratic values of gifted and normal intelligence students and to examine them according to different variables. “Is there a difference between the democratic values of gifted secondary school students who receive supportive education in SACs and normal intelligent students in secondary schools?” In this context, the sub-problems of the research can be expressed as follows:

1. Is there a difference between the democratic values of gifted students receiving supportive education in SACs and secondary school students?
2. Is there any difference between the democratic values of gifted students receiving supportive education in SACs middle school students in terms of gender?
3. Is there any difference between the democratic values of gifted students receiving supportive education in SACs and middle school students in terms of family income?
4. Is there any difference between the democratic values of gifted students receiving supportive education in SACs and middle school students in terms of grade level?

In literature, there are studies on determining the democratic values of secondary school students. However, no studies on the democratic values of gifted students have been found. It is considered that this study will contribute to the literature by comparing the democratic values of gifted middle school students who receive support

education in SACs and normal intelligence students in secondary schools. In addition, based on the results obtained in this study, it can be stated that it will contribute to the studies that will be conducted separately in order to determine the democratic values of both gifted students having supportive education in SACs and middle school students.

METHOD

Method of the Study

In this research, causal-comparative method, one of the quantitative research methods, was used. Causal-comparative studies are the studies that aim to determine the causes of an existing, naturally occurring, situation or event and the variables that affect these causes or the results of an effect (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2008: 185).

Study Group

In the study, convenient sampling which is one of the purposeful sampling types was used. In convenient sampling, the researcher chooses a situation that is close and easily accessible. This method gives the research speed and practicality. Although this sampling method is widely used, the results are less generalizable (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008).

The study group of the study consists of secondary school students receiving support education in Nevşehir Halil İncekara SAC, Niğde Akşemseddin SAC, Karaman SAC, and students studying at Niğde Abdülhamit Han Secondary School, Nevşehir İstiklal Secondary School, Karaman Yunus Emre Secondary School. The necessary permissions were obtained from the Ministry of National Education. According to the schedule of the study, the data collection tool was applied to 120 secondary school students with normal intelligence type studying at grades between 5th and 8th grades, and 72 gifted students receiving support education in SACs between 5th and 8th grades.

Data Collection Tools

In this study, it was aimed to determine to what extent gifted and normal intelligence secondary school students have democratic values. In the study, "Democratic Values Scale" and "Personal Information Form" developed by İlğan, Karayığit & Çetin (2013) were used. The Democratic Values Scale was designed as a 5-point Likert-type scale consisting of 6 (six) dimensions and 24 items. The total variance explained by the dimensions ranged from 6.8 to 10.66% and reliability coefficients ranged from .60 to .716. The scale explains 53.86% of the total variance and the alpha reliability coefficient is .86. According to these results, the scale is considered to be valid and reliable (İlğan et al., 2013).

Data Analysis

In the analysis of the data obtained from the scale applied in the study, IBM SPSS 21.0 “Statistical Package for the Social Sciences” was used. Significance level was taken as $p \leq .05$ in all the analyzes. For the purposes of the study, it was seen that the mean scores obtained from the sub-factors and overall of the scale were analyzed by Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z-Test for the distribution of normality and Levene homogeneity test for the homogeneity of variance distributions and compared to $p > .05$. Parametric tests were used to compare the mean differences due to the fact that the comparison groups were independent of each other, the scores obtained from the scale were continuous data, and they met the assumptions of normality and homogeneity. Independent-Samples t-test and One-Way ANOVA were used to determine whether the mean scores obtained from the scale differed according to independent variables. In the event that significant differences occurred as a result of the analyzes, LSD analysis, which is one of the Post-Hoc analysis techniques, was used to determine the difference between groups. Cohen’s d effect size was used to calculate the effect size in the t-test analyzes, and Cohen’s f effect sizes were used to calculate the effect size based on the variance in the ANOVA analysis. Criteria for interpretation of impact magnitudes were 0.20’ small for Cohen’s d; $0.50 \leq$ middle; $0.80 \leq$ large effect size and Cohen’s f $0.10 \leq$ small; $0.25 \leq$ middle; 0.40 was interpreted as the large effect size (Cohen, 1988).

FINDINGS (RESULTS)

Table 1 shows the information of the students in secondary schools and gifted students who received supportive education in SACs. According to the data obtained from “Democratic Values Scale”, there was a significant difference in the level of having democratic values among students who received support education in SACs ($n = 72$) and in secondary schools ($n = 120$) ($t_{(188)} = 1.62$, $p = .105 > .05$) When the sub-dimensions were examined, only in “Tolerance and Diversity” dimension of Science and Art Center students' scores ($\bar{X} = 16.78$) was higher than the scores of students in secondary schools ($\bar{X} = 15.64$) and this difference between the average $t_{(188)} = 2.49$, $p = .013 < .05$. There was no significant difference in other dimensions.

The data obtained reveal that the democratic values of secondary school and students receiving supportive education in SACs were similar. This situation can be explained by the fact that values are an abstract concept, as Atabey and Ömeroğlu (2016) stated. When Cohen’s d (0.39) coefficient was calculated for the sub-factor of “Tolerance and Diversity”, which is a significant difference. It is seen that the statistically significant difference affects the difference between means at a small effect level.

Table.1 Democratic Value Scale Score t-Test Results of Students in SACs and Secondary School Students

Factors	School Type	N	\bar{X}	Ss	sd	t	p	Cohen’s d
Respect for Equality and Differences	SAC	72	23.01	2.50	190	.508	.612	
	Secondary School	120	22.84	2.13				
Respect for the Rights of Others	SAC	72	21.72	3.14	190	.670	.604	
	Secondary School	120	21.41	3.15				
Tolerance and Diversity	SAC	72	16.78	2.52	190	2.497	.013*	0.39
	Secondary School	120	15.64	3.33				
Freedom of Others	SAC	72	13.67	1.82	190	1.452	.148	

	Secondary School	120	13.25	1.98			
Respect for Individual Differences	SAC	72	18.14	2.60	190	1.066	.288
	Secondary School	120	17.77	2.17			
Sensitivity to Differences	SAC	72	12.71	2.62	190	1.282	.201
	Secondary School	120	12.24	2.33			
Total	SAC	72	106.03	12.96	190	1.628	.105
	Secondary School	120	103.15	11.15			

*p< .05

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the scores of female students ($\bar{X} = 17.50$) in SACs in the “Tolerance and Diversity” sub-dimension were higher than the scores of female students in secondary schools ($\bar{X} = 16.32$) and this difference was between the averages $t_{(93)} = 2.12, p = .036 < .05$.

It is seen that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the female students receiving supportive education in SACs and those who were in secondary schools in terms of other sub-factors and the scale in general. In the sub-factor “Freedom of Others”, the scores of male students ($\bar{X} = 13.82$) receiving supportive education in SACs were higher than the scores of male students in secondary schools ($\bar{X} = 12.84$) and this difference between the averages $t_{(93)} = 2.08, p = .040 < .05$ was significant. It is seen that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of male students receiving supportive education in SACs and secondary school education in terms of other sub-factors and overall scale.

Table 2. t-Test Results of the Students Receiving Supportive Education in SACs and those Studying in Secondary Schools According to the Gender Variable

Gender*School	School Type	N	\bar{X}	S	t	sd	p	Cohen's d	
Female	Respect for Equality and Differences	SAC	38	23.24	1.65	-.407	95	.685	
		Secondary School	59	23.39	1.90				
	Respect for the Rights of Others	SAC	38	22.18	1.92	.184	95	.854	
		Secondary School	59	22.08	2.94				
	Tolerance and Diversity	SAC	38	17.50	1.77	2.122	95	.036*	0.45
		Secondary School	59	16.32	3.11				
	Freedom of Others	SAC	38	13.53	1.25	-.474	95	.636	
		Secondary School	59	13.68	1.70				
	Respect for Individual Differences	SAC	38	18.32	2.09	.313	95	.755	
		Secondary School	59	18.19	1.92				
Sensitivity to Differences	SAC	38	13.50	1.62	1.214	95	.228		
	Secondary School	59	13.05	1.87					
Total	SAC	38	108.26	7.49	.823	95	.413		
	Secondary School	59	106.71	9.94					
Male	Respect for Equality and Differences	SAC	34	22.76	3.21	.812	93	.419	
		Secondary School	61	22.31	2.21				
	Respect for the Rights of Others	SAC	34	21.21	4.07	.595	93	.553	
		Secondary School	61	20.75	3.22				
	Tolerance and Diversity	SAC	34	15.97	2.99	1.408	93	.163	
		Secondary School	61	14.98	3.42				
	Freedom of Others	SAC	34	13.82	2.32	2.081	93	.040*	0.42
		Secondary School	61	12.84	2.16				
	Respect for Individual Differences	SAC	34	17.94	3.09	1.031	93	.305	
		Secondary School	61	17.36	2.34				
Sensitivity to Differences	SAC	34	11.82	3.20	.618	93	.538		
	Secondary School	61	11.46	2.47					
Total	SAC	34	103.53	16.92	1.320	93	.190		
	Secondary School	61	99.70	11.24					

*p<.05

When Cohen’s d (0.45) coefficient was calculated for the sub-factor of “Tolerance and Diversity”, which is a significant difference among female students, the difference between the averages had a small effect level. When Cohen’s d (0.42) coefficient was calculated for the sub-factor of “Freedom of Others”, which is a significant difference in male students, statistically significant difference between the averages and it had a small effect level. When the data in Table 3 was examined, it is seen that there was no significant difference between the gender and democratic values of the students studying in SAC in terms of total scores obtained from the scale ($t_{(70)}=1.563$, $p = .123 > .05$). However, the scale in terms of “Tolerance and diversity” ($t_{(70)} = 2.67$; $p = .009 < .05$) and “Sensitivity to differences” ($t_{(70)} = 2.844$; $p = .006 < .05$) dimensions, female students had higher democratic values than male students.

When the gender variable was examined according to secondary schools, it was determined that the whole scale ($t_{(118)}; 3.613$; $p = .000 < .05$) and all sub-dimensions (“Respect for Equality and Differences” ($t_{(118)} = 2.860$; $p = .005 < .05$); Respect for the Rights of Others ($t_{(118)}; 2,359$; $p = .020 < .05$); Tolerance and Diversity ($t_{(118)}; 2,240$; $p = .027 < .05$); Freedom of Others ($t_{(118)}; 2,368$; $p = .019 < .05$); Respect for Individual Differences ($t_{(118)}; 2.112$; $p = .037 < .05$); Sensitivity to Differences ($t_{(118)}; 3,966$; $p = .000 < .05$) There was a significant difference in favor of female students. When the Cohen's d (0.62) and the Cohen's d (0.66) coefficients was calculated for the “Tolerance and Diversity” sub-factor, there were significant differences among the students receiving supportive education in SACs, it was found that the statistical significance had a moderate effect on the differences between the averages.

Table 3. One-way ANOVA Results of Democratic Value Scale Scores of Gender and Variable of Students Receiving Supportive Education in SACs and Secondary School Students

School* Gender	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S	t	sd	p	Cohen's d	
SAC	Respect for Equality and Differences	Female	38	23.24	1.65	.797	70	.428	
		Male	34	22.76	3.21				
	Respect for the Rights of Others	Female	38	22.18	1.92	1.328	70	.188	
		Male	34	21.21	4.07				
	Tolerance and Diversity	Female	38	17.50	1.77	2.675	70	.009*	0.62
		Male	34	15.97	2.99				
	Freedom of Others	Female	38	13.53	1.25	-.688	70	.494	
		Male	34	13.82	2.32				
	Respect for Individual Differences	Female	38	18.32	2.09	.607	70	.546	
		Male	34	17.94	3.09				
	Sensitivity to Differences	Female	38	13.50	1.62	2.844	70	.006*	0.66
		Male	34	11.82	3.20				
	Total	Female	38	108.26	7.49	1.563	70	.123	
		Male	34	103.53	16.92				
Secondary School	Respect for Equality and Differences	Female	59	23.39	1.90	2.860	118	.005*	0.52
		Male	61	22.31	2.21				
	Respect for the Rights of Others	Female	59	22.08	2.94	2.359	118	.020*	0.43
		Male	61	20.75	3.22				
	Tolerance and Diversity	Female	59	16.32	3.11	2.240	118	.027*	0.41
		Male	61	14.98	3.42				
	Freedom of Others	Female	59	13.68	1.70	2.368	118	.019*	0.43
		Male	61	12.84	2.16				
	Respect for Individual Differences	Female	59	18.19	1.92	2.112	118	.037*	0.39
		Male	61	17.36	2.34				
	Sensitivity to Differences	Female	59	13.05	1.87	3.966	118	.000*	0.73
		Male	61	11.46	2.47				
	Total	Female	59	106.71	9.94	3.613	118	.000*	0.66
		Male	61	99.70	11.24				

* $p < .05$

When Table 4 was examined, it was observed that there was a statistically significant difference between the scores obtained from democratic values scale of the students who receive supportive education in SACs ($F_{(2-117)}=4.359; .050 < p$) and those of secondary school students ($F_{(2-117)}=4.909; .050 < p$). LSD multiple comparison test was applied to the data obtained in order to determine which groups had significant differences. According to the results of the multiple comparison test, there was a significant difference between the students who had family 6001 TL and above income and the students who had a family income of 3000 TL and below, which was in favor of those who had 6001 and above income.

Table 4. One Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Results of Democratic Value Scale Scores According to Family Income Level Variable of the Students Receiving Supportive Education in SACs and those of Secondary School Students

School		Family Income Level	N	\bar{X}	S	F	p	Post Hoc (LSD)	Cohen's f
SAC	Respect for Equality and Differences	3000 TL and Below	25	22.08	3.40	3.154	.049*	3>1	0.30
		3001-6000 TL	23	23.22	2.07				
		6001 TL and Above	24	23.79	1.25				
	Respect for the Rights of Others	3000 TL and Below	25	20.48	3.83	3.583	.033*	3>1	0.32
		3001-6000 TL	23	22.00	2.97				
		6001 TL and Above	24	22.75	1.94				
	Tolerance and Diversity	3000 TL and Below	25	16.00	2.61	4.797	.011*	3>1	0.37
		3001-6000 TL	23	16.35	2.42				
		6001 TL and Above	24	18.00	2.13				
	Freedom of Others	3000 TL and Below	25	12.96	2.19	3.774	.028*	3>1	0.33
		3001-6000 TL	23	13.74	1.91				
		6001 TL and Above	24	14.33	0.87				
	Respect for Individual Differences	3000 TL and Below	25	17.36	3.21	1.846	.166		
		3001-6000 TL	23	18.39	2.23				
		6001 TL and Above	24	18.71	2.07				
	Sensitivity to Differences	3000 TL and Below	25	11.96	2.98	3.022	.055		
		3001-6000 TL	23	12.48	2.76				
		6001 TL and Above	24	13.71	1.71				
Total	3000 TL and Below	25	100.84	16.58	4.359	.016*	3>1	0.36	
	3001-6000 TL	23	106.17	11.52					
	6001 TL ve Above	24	111.29	6.84					
Secondary School	Respect for Equality and Differences	3000 TL and Below	67	22.61	2.44	1.404	.250		
		3001-6000 TL	34	22.91	1.66				
		6001 TL and Above	19	23.53	1.54				
	Respect for the Rights of Others	3000 TL and Below	67	20.99	3.34	2.807	.064		
		3001-6000 TL	34	21.41	3.14				
		6001 TL and Above	19	22.89	1.88				
	Tolerance and Diversity	3000 TL and Below	67	15.51	3.43	2.049	.134		
		3001-6000 TL	34	15.15	3.30				
		6001 TL and Above	19	17.00	2.73				
	Freedom of Others	3000 TL and Below	67	13.16	2.09	2.968	.055		
		3001-6000 TL	34	12.88	2.03				
		6001 TL and Above	19	14.21	1.13				
	Respect for Individual Differences	3000 TL and Below	67	17.76	2.25	2.677	.073		
		3001-6000 TL	34	17.26	2.22				
		6001 TL and Above	19	18.68	1.49				
	Sensitivity to Differences	3000 TL and Below	67	11.90	2.54	6.635	.002*	3>1	0.34
		3001-6000 TL	34	11.97	1.95				
		6001 TL and Above	19	13.95	1.27				
Total	3000 TL and Below	67	101.93	12.61	4.909	.009*	3>1	0.29	
	3000 TL and Below	34	101.59	8.28					
	6001 TL and Above	19	110.26	6.98					

* $p < .05$ Criteria: 3000 TL and Below=1; 3001-6000 TL=2; 6001 TL and Above=3

The data given in Table 4, which shows the relationship between the democratic values of the students and their family income in terms of the sub-dimensions regarding “Respect for Equality and Differences”, “Respect for the Rights of Others”, “Tolerance and Diversity” and “Freedom of Others”, reveals that there is a significant difference between the students who have a family income of 6001 and above and the students who have a family income of 3000 TL and below, which is in favor of those who have a family income of 6001 and above.

As for the secondary school students, there was a significant difference between students with family income of 6001 TL and above and those with family income of 3000 TL and below only in the “Sensitivity to Differences” sub-dimension. The difference was in favor of those with family income of 6001 TL and above.

In the students receiving supportive education in SACs, Cohen’s f (0.30) was calculated for the sub-factor “Respect for Equality and Diversity”, Cohen’s f (0.32), was calculated for the sub-factor “Respect for the Rights of Others”, Cohen’s f (0.37), was calculated for the sub-factor “Tolerance and Diversity”, Cohen’s f (0.36) coefficients was calculated for “Freedom of Others” Cohen’s f (0.33) and total score was Cohen’s f (0.36). It was determined that the differences of mean scores had a moderate effect. When coefficients of Cohen’s f (0.34) for the sub-factor “Sensitivity to Differences” and of Cohen’s f (0.29) for the total scale were analyzed, it was seen that the difference between the means was statistically significant.

For the students studying in secondary schools, Cohen’s d was calculated for the sub-factor “Respect for Equality and Differences”, the sub-factor “Sensitivity to Differences” and the total scale and the coefficients were found 0.52, 0.73 and 0.66 respectively, which shows that the differences of mean scores had a moderate effect. Cohen’s d (0.43) was calculated for “Respect for the Rights of Others”, Cohen’s d (0.41) was calculated for “Tolerance and Diversity”, Cohen’s d (0.43) was calculated for “Independence of Others”, Cohen’s d (0.39) “Respect for Individual Differences”, which reveals that the differences of mean scores had a small effect.

Table 5. One- Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) results of the Students Receiving Supportive Education in SACs and those Studying in Secondary Schools in terms of the Variable Related to Democratic Value Scale

School	Level of Grades	N	\bar{X}	S	F	p	Post Hoc (LSD)	Cohen’s f
SAC	Respect for Equality and Differences	5 th Grade	19	22.47	1.84	.633	.596	
		6 th Grade	19	23.58	2.14			
		7 th Grade	18	22.89	3.80			
		8 th Grade	16	23.13	1.71			
	Respect for the Rights of Others	5 th Grade	19	21.68	3.27	1.718	.172	
		6 th Grade	19	22.95	2.93			
		7 th Grade	18	21.44	3.78			
		8 th Grade	16	20.63	2.00			
	Tolerance and Diversity	5 th Grade	19	16.79	2.74	1.151	.335	
		6 th Grade	19	17.63	2.43			
		7 th Grade	18	16.33	2.89			
		8 th Grade	16	16.25	1.77			
Freedom of Others	5 th Grade	19	13.42	1.22	1.693	.177		
	6 th Grade	19	14.37	1.42				
	7 th Grade	18	13.72	2.40				
	8 th Grade	16	13.06	1.98				
	5 th Grade	19	17.21	2.53	1.486	.226		

Secondary School	Respect for Individual Differences	6 th Grade	19	18.95	1.58				
		7 th Grade	18	18.33	3.56				
		8 th Grade	16	18.06	2.24				
	Sensitivity to Differences	5 th Grade	19	12.58	2.85				
		6 th Grade	19	13.21	2.46	.362	.781		
		7 th Grade	18	12.67	2.81				
	Total	8 th Grade	16	12.31	2.44				
		5 th Grade	19	104.16	12.95				
		6 th Grade	19	110.68	10.21	1.186	.322		
	Respect for Equality and Differences	7 th Grade	18	105.39	17.81				
		8 th Grade	16	103.44	8.37				
		5 th Grade	15	23.73	1.28				
	Respect for the Rights of Others	6 th Grade	32	23.13	1.84	3.608	.016*	5>8	0.31
		7 th Grade	46	22.98	1.64				
		8 th Grade	27	21.78	3.06				
	Tolerance and Diversity	5 th Grade	15	22.47	2.56				
		6 th Grade	32	21.84	2.95	1.434	.237		
		7 th Grade	46	21.24	2.98				
	Freedom of Others	8 th Grade	27	20.59	3.80				
		5 th Grade	15	16.93	3.13				
6 th Grade		32	15.09	2.87	1.620	.189			
Respect for Individual Differences	7 th Grade	46	16.00	3.32					
	8 th Grade	27	14.96	3.81					
	5 th Grade	15	14.07	1.67					
Sensitivity to Differences	6 th Grade	32	13.16	1.99	2.970	.035*	5>8	0.28	
	7 th Grade	46	13.54	1.54					
	8 th Grade	27	12.41	2.53					
Total	5 th Grade	15	18.60	1.80					
	6 th Grade	32	17.97	1.91	2.416	.070			
	7 th Grade	46	17.87	2.27					
Respect for Equality and Differences	8 th Grade	27	16.89	2.31					
	5 th Grade	15	13.07	1.83					
	6 th Grade	32	12.34	2.24	1.665	.178			
Sensitivity to Differences	7 th Grade	46	12.35	2.21					
	8 th Grade	27	11.48	2.75					
	5 th Grade	15	108.87	8.92					
Total	6 th Grade	32	103.53	9.48	3.453	.019*	5>8	0.30	
	7 th Grade	46	103.98	10.58					
	8 th Grade	27	98.11	13.35					

* $p < .05$

When the data in Table 5 were examined, it was observed that there was no significant difference between the grade levels and democratic values of students receiving supportive training in SACs. $F_{(2-72)} = 1.186$; $p = .322 > .05$). “Respect for Equality and Differences” ($F_{(2-117)} = 3.608$; $p = .016 < .05$) and “Freedom of Others” ($F_{(2-117)} = 2.970$; $p = 0.35 < .05$) and the total score obtained from the overall scale ($F_{(2-117)} = 3.453$; $p = 0.19 < .05$) was found to be a significant difference in favor of students who were studying at the 5th grade. Cohen's f (0.31) was calculated for the “Equality and Respect for Differences” sub-factor, Cohen's f (0.28) was calculated for the sub-factor “Freedom of Others” and Cohen's f (0.30) was calculated for the total score. It was determined that the differences of mean scores had a moderate effect.

CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION

In the current study, the level of superior and normal intelligence secondary school students' democratic values was examined comparatively in terms of various variables. It has been concluded that there is no significant difference between the levels of having democratic values among the students who have received supportive education in SACs and those who are in secondary schools. In the literature, there is no comparative study on the level of possessing democratic values of superior and normal intelligence secondary school students. Based on the findings, it can be stated that it does not have any positive effect on gaining or developing democratic values to the students receiving support education in the SACs identified as the study group.

When the level of having democratic values of the students who receive supportive education in SACs and those who are in secondary schools was compared according to gender variable, it was concluded that there was no significant difference in the overall total score obtained from the scale. It was seen that students who receive supportive education in SACs had higher levels of democratic values in the "Tolerance and Diversity" sub-factor of the scale. As for the "Freedom of Others" sub-factor, it was found that male students receiving support education in SACs had higher democratic value levels than male students in secondary schools. In the related literature, no study has been found that compare the level of democratic values of gifted and normal students in terms of gender. In the future studies, it is thought that testing this variable with different sample groups will serve the purpose of understanding the issue.

When the gender variable was examined separately on the basis of school; it was found that there was no significant difference between the gender and democratic values of SACs according to the total scores obtained from the scale. However, it is seen that female students had higher democratic values than male students in terms of "Tolerance and Diversity" and "Sensitivity to Differences" sub-factors. When the gender variable was examined according to secondary schools, it is concluded that there was a significant difference in favor of female students in the whole scale and in all sub-dimensions that compose the scale.

This result is in line with the research findings conducted by Konaş, Selçuk & Polat (2016), Bektaş-Öztaşkın & İcen (2015), Ural & Sağlam (2011) and Yüksek, Bağcı & Vatansever (2013). Yıldırım (2018) also examined the democratic citizenship attitudes of the students who could be stated to have a close relationship with the subject discussed in this study and found a significant difference in favor of female students.

İlğan et al. (2013) developed the democratic values scale for secondary school students and examined the level of male and female students' democratic values. According to the findings of the study, it was concluded that the total scores obtained by the female students were higher than the male students in the "Respect for Equality" and "Respect for Individual Differences" dimensions. As for gifted students; the results obtained by Assouline, Colangelo, Heo, Dockery (2013), Frank Webb, Vandiver & Jeung (2016), Mohamed, Kazem, Pfeiffer, Alzubaidi, Elwan, Ambosaidi, Al-Washahi & Al-Khaarosi (2017) are similar to the results obtained in the current study.

As a result of the study, it was found that there was a significant difference between the variables of family income status and the level of having democratic values among the students who receive supportive education in SACs and studying in secondary schools. In both study groups, there was a significant difference between the students with a family income of 6001 TL or above and those with a family income of 3000 TL or below. The difference was found in favor of those with a family income of 6001 TL or above. Likewise, Olszewski-Kubilius, Lee & Thomson (2014), VanTassel-Baska & Stambaugh (2017) found that families with good income were effective in having the values of “respect and tolerance” within the scale of democratic values used in this study.

In the study, it was concluded that there was no significant difference between the grade levels and the democratic value levels of the students receiving supportive education in SACs. When the democratic values of secondary school students were analyzed in terms of the grade level variable, it was found that there was a significant difference in terms of “Equality and Respect for Differences” and “Freedom of Others” dimensions and the total score obtained from the overall scale in favor of 5th grade students. It was found that the level of having democratic values decreased as the grade levels of the students in secondary schools increased. This result contradicts with the findings of the study by Ural and Sağlam (2011), which found no significant differences in students’ their democratic attitudes in terms of their grade levels. This study was conducted on the students who received supportive education in SACs specified in the study group and who were studying in secondary schools.

SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results obtained from this study, it is recommended that;

- The curricula to support the democratic values of students in SACs should be updated.
- The scales, both the one used in this study and others that include different dimensions of democratic values should be used to determine the democratic values of students.
- The number and diversity of samples should increase in future studies so that the issue can be better understood and explained.

REFERENCES

- Akarsu, F. (2004). *Üstün Yetenekliler*. In M. R. Şirin, A. Kulaksızoğlu ve A. E. Bilgili (Ed.), *Türkiye Üstün Yetenekli Çocuklar Kongresi Seçilmiş Makaleler Kitabı (Vol 63)* (pp. 127-154). İstanbul: Çocuk Vakfı.
- Assouline, S. G., Colangelo, N., Heo, N., & Dockery, L. (2013). High-Ability Students’ Participation in Specialized Instructional Delivery Models: Variations by Aptitude, Grade, Gender and Content Area. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 57(2), 135–147.
- Atabey, D., & Ömeroğlu, E. (2016). Okul Öncesi Sosyal Değerler Kazanımı Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 19(35), 101–136.
- Bektaş-Öztaşkın, Ö. B., & İçen, M. (2015). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Hoşgörü Eğilimleri ile Demokrasi Algıları Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. *Karadeniz Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 7(1), 39–56.

- Büyükdüvenci, S. (1990). Demokrasi, Eğitim ve Türkiye. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23(2), 583–597.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E., Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2008). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for The Behavioral Sciences*. (Second Edition), Hillsdale. New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Çetinkaya, Ç. (2013). *Sıradışı Konular Çalışma Etkinliklerinin Yaratıcılığa Etkisi*. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Çanakkale, Türkiye.
- Çetinkaya, Ç. & Kıncal, R. Y. (2015). Üstün Zekâlı Ve Yetenekli Çocukların Demokrasi Eğitimi. *Journal of Gifted Education Research*, 3(1), 1–22.
- Davaslıgil, Ü. (2004). *Üstün Yetenekliler*. In M. R. Şirin, A. Kulaksızoğlu ve A. E. Bilgili (Ed.), *1. Türkiye Üstün Yetenekli Çocuklar Kongresi Seçilmiş Makaleler Kitabı (Vol 63)* (pp. 211-218). İstanbul: Çocuk Vakfı.
- Ertürk, S. (1981). *Diktacı Tutum Ve Demokrasi [Dictatorial Attitude and Democracy]*. Ankara: Yelkenetepe.
- Frank Webb, A., Vandiver, B. J., & Jeung, S. (2016). Does Completing an Enriched Writing Course Improve Writing Self-Efficacy of Talented Secondary Students? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 60(1), 47–62.
- Freeman, J. (2001). *Gifted Children Grown Up*. London: David Fulton.
- Freeman, J. Raffan, J., & Warwick, I. (2010). *Worldwide Provision to Develop Gifts and Talents: An International Survey*. Berkshire, England: CFBT Education Trust
- Gross, M. (1998). The ‘Me’ Behind the Mask: Intellectually Gifted Students and The Search for Identity. *Roeper Review*, 20(3), 167–174.
- İbret, B. Ü., Reçepoğlu, E., Avcı, E. K., & Reçepoğlu, S. (2018). Öğretmen Adaylarının “Demokrasi” Kavramına Yönelik Metafor Algıları. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(5), 421–441.
- İlğan, A., Karayığit, D. & Çetin, B. (2013). Ortaokul Öğrencilerinin Demokratik Değerlere Sahip Olma Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(2), 97–118.
- Karadağ, E., Baloğlu, N. & Yalçınkayalar, P. (2006). İlköğretim Okulu Yöneticilerinin Öğretmenler Tarafından Algılanan Demokratik Tutumları ile Öğretmenleri Demokratik Değerleri Üzerine İlişkisel Bir Araştırma. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 4(12), 65–82.
- Karakütük, K. (2001). *Demokratik Laik Eğitim* Ankara: Anı.
- Kontaş, H., Selçuk, E., & Polat, M. (2016). Ortaokul Öğretmenlerinin Demokratik Tutumları ile Öğrencilerin Demokratik Değerlere Sahip Olma Düzeylerinin İncelenmesi. *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies*, 44, 141–151.
- Kurnaz, A., Çiftci, Ü., & Karapazar, H. (2013). Üstün Zekâlı ve Yetenekli Öğrencilerin Değer Algılarının Betimsel Bir Analizi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 11(26), 185–225.
- MacMath, S. (2008). Implementing Democratic Pedagogy into Classroom: Putting Dewey Into Practice. *Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education*, 1(1), 1–12.
- Ministry of National Education [MNE] (2006). *Özel Eğitim Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği*. Retrieved on 12 June 2019 from <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2006/05/20060531-2.htm>.

- Mohamed, A. H. H., Kazem, A. M., Pfeiffer, S. I., Alzubaidi, A-Q., Elwan, R. A., Ambosaidi, A., Al-Washahi, M., & Al-Khaarosi, T. (2017). Identification of Gifted Students in Oman: Gender and Grade Differences on The Gifted Rating Scales-School Form. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 40(3), 29–301.
- Moss, P., & Dahlberg, G. (2008). Beyond quality in Early Childhood Education and Care: Languages of Evaluation. *New Zealand Journal of Teachers' Work*, 5(1), 3–12.
- Oğuz, A. (2011). Öğretmen Adaylarının Demokratik Değerleri ile Öğretme ve Öğrenme Anlayışları. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 9(22), 139–160.
- Oktay, A. (2001). 21. Yüzyılda Yeni Eğilimler ve Eğitim. Inside; 21. *Yüzyılda eğitim ve Türk eğitim sistemi*. İstanbul: Serdar.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Lee, S. Y., & Thomson, D. (2014). Family Environment and Social Development in Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 58(3), 199–216.
- Özbay, Y., & Palancı, M. (2011). Üstün Yetenekli Çocuk ve Ergenlerin Psikososyal Özellikleri. *Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 22, 89–108.
- Özdaş, F., Ekinci, A., & Bindak, R. (2014). Öğretmenlerin Demokrasiye İlişkin Tutumlarının Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 15(3), 65–81.
- Özgüven, İ. E. (1994). *Psikolojik testler*. Ankara: Yeni Doğuş.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1999). What Is Thing Called Giftedness and How Do We Develop It? A Twenty-Five Year Perspective. *Journal for the Education of Gifted*. 23(1), 3–54.
- Renzulli, J. S. (2012). Reexamining the Role of Gifted Education and Talent Development for the 21st Century: A Four-Part Theoretical Approach. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 56(3), 150–159.
- Selvi, K. (2006). Developing A Teacher Trainees' Democratic Values Scale: Validity and Reliability Analyses. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 34(9), 1171–1178.
- Shechtman, Z. (2002). Validation of The Democratic Teacher Belief Scale (DTBS). *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 9, 363–377.
- Subba, D. (2014). Democratic Values and Democratic Approach in Teaching: A Perspective. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(12A), 37–40.
- Ural, S. N., & Sağlam, H. İ. (2011). İlköğretim Öğretim Öğrencilerinin Demokratik Tutum Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*. 9 (22), 161–180.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Stambaugh, T. (2017). Introduction to The Special Issue on Gifted Students from Low-Income Households. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 62(1), 3–5.
- Yıldırım, C. (2018). *Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinin Demokratik Vatandaşlık Tutumlarının Resmi ve Örtük Program Açısından İncelenmesi*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2006). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (6. Ed.). Ankara: Seçkin.