

"İŞ, GÜÇ" ENDÜSTRİ İLİŞKİLERİ VE İNSAN KAYNAKLARI DERGİSİ

"IS, GUC" INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS AND HUMAN RESOURCES JOURNAL

2017 Cilt/Vol: 19/Num:2 Sayfa/Page: 1-30

Editörler Kurulu / Executive Editorial Group

Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University)
K. Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)
Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

Editör / Editor in Chief

Şenol Baştürk (Uludağ University)

Yayın Kurulu / Editorial Board

Doç. Dr. Erdem Cam (ÇAŞGEM)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Zerrin Fırat (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Aşkın Keser (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Ahmet Sevimli (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Abdulkadir Şenkal (Kocaeli University)
Doç. Dr. Gözde Yılmaz (Marmara University)
Yrd. Doç. Dr. Memet Zencirkıran (Uludağ University)

Uluslararası Danışma Kurulu / International Advisory Board

Prof. Dr. Ronald Burke (York University-Kanada)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Glenn Dawes (James Cook University-Avustralya)
Prof. Dr. Jan Dul (Erasmus University-Hollanda)
Prof. Dr. Alev Efendioğlu (University of San Francisco-ABD)
Prof. Dr. Adrian Furnham (University College London-İngiltere)
Prof. Dr. Alan Geare (University of Otago- Yeni Zelanda)
Prof. Dr. Ricky Griffin (TAMU-Texas A&M University-ABD)
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Diana Lipinskiene (Kaunos University-Litvanya)
Prof. Dr. George Manning (Northern Kentucky University-ABD)
Prof. Dr. William (L.) Murray (University of San Francisco-ABD)
Prof. Dr. Mustafa Özbilgin (Brunel University-UK)
Assoc. Prof. Owen Stanley (James Cook University-Avustralya)
Prof. Dr. Işık Urla Zeytinoğlu (McMaster University-Kanada)

Ulusal Danışma Kurulu / National Advisory Board

Prof. Dr. Yusuf Alper (Uludağ University)
Prof. Dr. Veysel Bozkurt (İstanbul University)
Prof. Dr. Toker Dereli (Işık University)
Prof. Dr. Nihat Erdoğan (İstanbul Şehir University)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Makal (Ankara University)
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Selamoğlu (Kocaeli University)
Prof. Dr. Nadir Suğur (Anadolu University)
Prof. Dr. Nursel Telman (Maltepe University)
Prof. Dr. Cavide Uyargil (İstanbul University)
Prof. Dr. Engin Yıldırım (Anayasa Mahkemesi)
Prof. Dr. Arzu Wasti (Sabancı University)

İş, Güç, Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, yılda dört kez yayınlanan hakemli, bilimsel elektronik dergidir. Çalışma hayatına ilişkin makalelere yer verilen derginin temel amacı, belirlenen alanda akademik gelişime ve paylaşım katkıda bulunmaktadır. "İş, Güç," Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi, 'Türkçe' ve 'İngilizce' olarak iki dilde makale yayınlanmaktadır.

"Is, Güc" The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is peer-reviewed, quarterly and electronic open sources journal. "Is, Güc" covers all aspects of working life and aims sharing new developments in industrial relations and human resources also adding values on related disciplines. "Is, Güc" The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources is published Turkish or English language.

TARANDIĞIMIZ INDEXLER



Dergide yayınlanan yazılardaki görüşler ve bu konudaki sorumluluk yazarlarına aittir.
Yayınlanan eserlerde yer alan tüm içerik kaynak gösterilmeden kullanılamaz.

All the opinions written in articles are under responsibilities of the authors.
The published contents in the articles cannot be used without being cited

“İş, Güç” Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi - © 2000- 2017

“Is, Güc” The Journal of Industrial Relations and Human Resources - © 2000- 2017

İÇİNDEKİLER

YIL: 2017 / CİLT: 19 SAYI: 2

SIRA	MAKALE BAŞLIĞI	SAYFA NUMARALARI
1	Öğr. Gör. Dr. Semih EKER, Doç. Dr. Melek EKER, Higher Education and Democratic – Libertarian Attitude: An Evidence from Turkey DOI: 10.4026/isguc.371021	5
2	Yrd. Doç.Dr. Duygu ACAR ERDUR, Farklılıkların Yönetimi Yaklaşımına İlişkin Eleştirel Bir Literatür İncelemesi DOI: 10.4026/isguc.371028	35
3	Prof. Dr. Aşkın KESER, Dr. Burcu ÖNGEN BİLİR, Prof. Dr. Serpil AYTAÇ, Niceliksel İş Yükü Envanterinin Geçerlilik ve Güvenilirlik Çalışması DOI: 10.4026/isguc.371035	55
4	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Özlem KAYA, Gizem AKALP, İş Sağlığı ve Güvenliği Açısından Elle Taşıma İşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi: Tekstil ve Otomotiv Sektörü Örneği DOI: 10.4026/isguc.371037	79
5	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Mehmet BİÇKES, Okt. Celal YILMAZ, Örgütsel Özdeşleşmenin Tükenmişlik Üzerine Etkisi DOI: 10.4026/isguc.371043	95
6	Yrd. Doç. Dr. Kerem GÖKTEN, Yrd. Doç. Dr. Çağatay Edgücan ŞAHİN, Çin Mucizesinde İnsanı Aramak: ILO Standartlarıyla Çin Çalışma İlişkilerinin Değerlendirilmesi DOI: 10.4026/isguc.371045	115

HIGHER EDUCATION AND DEMOCRATIC-LIBERTARIAN ATTITUDE: AN EVIDENCE FROM TURKEY¹

Semih Eker²

Melek Eker³

ÖZET

Bu çalışma yüksek öğretimin demokratik-liberteryen davranışa etkisini incelemektedir. Öğrencilerin hak ve özgürlüklere yönelik desteği bu konuda bir gösterge olarak kabul edilmiştir. Çalışmanın temelini oluşturan anket Uludağ Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi öğrencileri arasında yapılmıştır. Sonuçlara göre, demokratik-liberteryen davranış üst sınıflarda olan ve başarılı olan öğrencilerde diğerlerine göre daha yüksektir. Bu çerçevede sonuçlar eğitimin demokratik-liberteryen davranışı olumlu etkilediğini göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yüksek Öğretim, Demokratik Kişilik, Demokratik-liberteryen davranış.

1 This articles has been supported by Uludag University Scientific Research Department with the number KUAP(İ) - 2013/63.

2 Lecturer, PhD., Uludag University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Bursa, Turkey, semiheker@uludag.edu.tr

3 Assoc. Prof., PhD., Uludag University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Business Administration, Bursa, Turkey, melekeker@uludag.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

This study examines the effect of higher education on democratic-libertarian attitude. For this aim, students' support for democratic civil rights and liberties are accepted as an indicator. The survey based on this study made among the students of Uludağ University Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty in Turkey. According to the results we can generally comment on this, more democratic-libertarian attitude is seen at upper classes and also successful students are more democratic-libertarian than others. The results are consistent with the classical argument that education affects democratic-libertarian attitude positively.

Keywords: Higher Education, Democratic Personality, Democratic-libertarian attitude

1. INTRODUCTION

The freedom of choice and election of the individuals, the freedom and fairness of the elections based on the rule of law, the independence and jurisdiction of the legislative, executive and judicial bodies representing the state, the expression (protest, demonstration and march) are the standards of contemporary democracy. The fact that society with democratic culture that includes democratic principles, procedures and attitudes in a large majority and under all circumstances makes these standards permanent and inclusive.

Democracy is becoming stronger in countries where the rule of law and justice are reflected in social life. As a matter of fact, many authors think that democracy is a system that can not be reduced only to existence of political institutions, but depends on democratic qualities and tendencies of vast majority of citizens (Will Kymlicka & Wayne Norman, 1994: 283-284). If most people do not give their support, there will be no democratic system based on human rights and individual freedom.

The concrete state of this support increase in political participation and acting a democratic way of individuals. Some authorities think that increase of these values may not be in a whole society but it is important to be among the economic, cultural, educational and political elites of society. As we see, this part of people in society are higher education students. In this study, we want to observe that whether higher education may lead to a greater commitment to democratic civil liberties and norms. In other words, we want to see the effect of higher education on democratic-libertarian attitude.

The goal of this study is to measure the democratic-libertarian attitude level of higher education students of the Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty of Uludağ University, Bursa, Turkey. In political science terminology, this means to identify social and demographic factors associated with democratic-libertarian political views as such fundamental rights as freedom of speech, assembly, press, and worship; the right to a public trial by jury; and protection against imprisonment or seizure of property without due process of law.

Although the survey was done at one faculty of university (2015) and the sample of 1153 students, the results can give us a chance to think about democratic-libertarian attitude of higher education students in Turkey. The sample of students have different kinds of social backgrounds and campus experiences. However, we can still evaluate the sample of students to make comparisons between ours and others.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Democratic Personality and Democratic-Libertarian Attitude

In psychology, the theories of personality, Jean Piaget and Lawrence Kohlberg form the theoretical basis for studies of political personality (Haan et al., 1968; Merelman, 1969, 1971; Lane, 1969; Tapp and Kohlberg, 1971; Adelson, 1971; Fishkin et al., 1973; Sarat, 1975; O'Connor, 1977; Patterson, 1979; Ward, 1982). According to the studies, political personality is shaped by the influence of close and distant environment, habits, commitment, political belief, value and emotional orientation (Norma et al., 1968; Greenstein, 1975).

In this shaping process, individual's ability to grasp, adaptability to social environment and character traits are independent variables (Binford, 1983; 670) So, democratic or authoritarian personality depends on individuals' cognitive capacity, social adaptability and characteristic features.

The environment can be identified as a social and political context of individuals in which test their behaviors. Individual's knowledge level and ability to read society (social learning ability) constitute cognitive dimension of attachment to environment. Depending on understanding, an environment can cause the individual to show democratic (Sniderman 1975) or authoritarian political attitudes (Greenstein 1965). Especially, relationship with close circle, which can be defined as a group of friends, can directly and permanently affect political thoughts and behaviors. An individual may politically have a democratic or an authoritarian personality according to structure of his group while observing harmony with his friends. Political personalities of these individuals are called as "other directed" type, where the influence of the group of friends is high determinative on their political tendencies (Riesman, 1961).

Changes and transformations experienced by an individual towards his inner world are also important in shaping political personality. Researches has shown that people are not independent of their ideological characters. Meaningful values of the individual and self-centered defense mechanisms can lead him to an ideology. A change of ideology can also be realized by psychological change. The studies show that those who have a psychology whose values and ideals are meaningful to themselves are democratic and on the other hand the individuals guided by the self-centered defense mechanisms are authoritarian. It is also observed that political tendencies determined by this psychology can be changed by an influence of intense emotional indoctrination, not by their environment.

The post-World War II period was a period of intense discussions on the concept, authoritarian personality (Berelson 1954, Pranger 1968, Pateman 1970, Knutson, 1972; Simpson, 1971) Lasswell (1951), Barbu (1956), Lane (1962), Greenstein (1965, 1968), Knutson (1972), Sniderman (1975). Democratic personality⁴ is seen as a solution as a type of political personality that will prevent the re-emergence of authoritarian and totalitarian systems in this environment. In this respect, while the authoritarian personality is defined as a personality disorder that embraces politically repressive practices (Christie and Jahoda 1954), on the other hand democratic personality is defined as a psychologically healthy perfect citizen of democratic society (Dennies Thompson 1970). Indeed, democrats can develop a social point of view for political affairs beyond the political attitudes and attitudes set out by everyday interests and thus internalize, interpret and transform the dominant

⁴ It is defined as a type of democratic citizen who believes in freedom, tolerant, sensitive to authoritarian tendencies, confident, lawful, sensitive to the rights of the individual, believes in the rule of law, and adopts democratic institutions, methods and methods with democratic morality.

values of a socio-political system that define political roles and rules (Binford, 1983; 675). The Democrats support the forms of civil disobedience, although they know that anti-democratic groups will benefit, but they still defend basic democratic rights, advocate individual liberties in the face of power, support its limitation, question the political system and power, view politics as a dialectical relationship process, And finally has a personality structure that sees politics as a phenomenon of ideal and reality (Binford; 678-679), on the other hand, the authoritarian people can lead to the formation of a political circle in which the high ego follows an attitude of oppression against the ones who are down to it and a submission to the ones above, where hatred and insecurity prevail (Lasswell, 1954; 221-223).

Different variables affect different ways of developing your political personality in the democratic direction (Stouffer, 1955; Prothro and Grigg, 1960; McClosky, 1964; Sniderman, 1975). For example, if the social environment influences the political personality emotionally rather than cognitively, the democratic behavior may not provide a stable image (Binford, 1983; 672-73). If the environment influences the individual in a way that enhances the level of comprehension and knowledge, he or she may emerge weakly emotional motivated types who know democratic principles and rules. While these types are vulnerable to voting, they can remain indifferent to direct forms of participation, such as demonstrations and hiking.

One aspect of a democratic personality is the height of political participation, the other is to have an ethical perspective that sees it as an indispensable right for others in all circumstances, even if they are in minority. According to authorities, this is very important to make democratic systems healthy and permanent. Authorities argued that if public support for basic democratic values is high, democracy will be inclusive and integrative for all members of society at all times. For this, citizens must believe and defend basic democratic rights and freedoms for all citizens. In other words, the more democratic-libertarian citizens are, the stronger democracy will be.

Democratic-libertarian individuals are tolerant who is "willingness to permit the expression of those ideas or interests that one opposes" and "one is tolerant to the extent one is prepared to extend freedoms to those whose ideas one rejects, whatever these might be" (Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus 1979; 784). Tolerant is the person who accepts and defends the right to exist of others who have different ideas and identities in all circumstances. Today tolerance has been suggested by many experts to have a more vital prescription for a democracy than a political agreement. Political agreement requires political consensus of all citizens, but political tolerance simply emphasizes the acceptance and respect for the political rights and liberties of others, whether one agrees with them or not.

Since the last twenty years, to support democratic-civil liberties has regarded as a feature of tolerants and measuring forms of tolerance. So, tolerants are not only show their tolerance or acceptance to dissident or marginal groups but also, and maybe even more, show democratic-libertarian attitudes in the form of support to democratic-civil liberties for all people. When we look at the related literature, we see the development of measuring tolerance towards measuring support of democratic-civil liberties or as we prefer to say democratic-libertarian attitude.

2.2. Measuring Democratic-Libertarian Attitude: Theoretical and Methodical Development in the Literature

The period that led to the study of tolerance was between 1940 and 1950. This period, which is a period of oppression in America, is known as the Maccarty period. The first study of this period of political repression is the work of Samuel Stouffer in 1955. In this study, Stouffer tried to show how Americans looked at the communists. According to his study, the vast majority of American people are looking positively for the suspension of the constitutional fundamental rights and freedoms (freedom of speech and assemble) of the communist (Stouffer, 1955). Another study in this regard belongs to Prothro and Grigg (1960). Their findings were consistent with Stouffer. People supported fundamental rights and freedoms in thought, but in practice they were negative in using and extending of basic rights by some minority and marginal groups.

Samuel Stouffer's method is the first method on political tolerance named the fixed-group (pre-selected) method. This method has also used by the American General Society Survey⁵. In this method, the researcher asks the opinion of the previously determined group that certain types of political activities should be allowed and measure the tolerance of specific groups of citizens for three fundamental rights: expression, education and media rights (Davis, 1975; Postic, 2011; Gibson, 1992; Sullivan & Transue, 1999; Chandler & Tsai, 2001). When determining the group, care must be taken to ensure that it includes the entire political spectrum of the country. This method has also been used in other studies (Nunn et al., 1978).

In 1979 Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus criticized the Stouffer's method for its one-dimensional examination of tolerance. According to them, this method measures the tolerance which is shaped by the individual's tendency towards a particular group (fascist, communist or Africans etc.). For example, individuals are more tolerant to individuals and groups who seems close to their ideology. So, this reduces the reliability of the method.

The work of Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus (1982) clearly falsified the Stouffer hypotheses. They developed a new approach to political tolerance named "least-liked" (or content controlled) group approach. In this method, respondents can choose the questions about political tolerance and also researcher wants respondents to identify the groups they dislike the most. Then the researcher makes predictions about how much the respondents are willing to extend the rights and freedoms of the groups in question. This approach is improved and used by many researchers (e.g., Gibson and Gouws 2003; Hinckley 2010; Petersen et al. 2011; Peffley and Rohrschneider 2003; Guérin, Petry, and Crête 2004)

With these methods, tolerance is measured in a way that is highly dependent on the situation and personal feelings and thoughts, and therefore the results are far from reflecting the general tolerance levels of the individual. For example, a person can look both tolerant and intolerant in different research conducted with these methods. This has led to the development of new methods.

The third approach aims to reveal to what extent people can tolerate the limitation of democratic rights and freedoms, in other words, to what extent do people support democratic civil liberties? The studies using this method try to reveal individuals' democratic-libertarian attitudes on the issues such as freedom of expression, such as limiting social media usage, monitoring e-mails, limiting

5 The GSS is a research that has been periodically published since 1972, aimed at monitoring the structural change of the American society, published in scientific research and published in serious media, and politically assessed. The research has been the basis of the International Society Research Program (ISSP) since 1984.

meetings and demonstrations (Gibson and Bingham, 1985; Davis and Silver, 2004; Davis, 2007; Hetherington and Suhay, 2011). In this method, individuals are being asked about their views on anti-democratic policies that restrict civil liberties and freedom. This method, widely used today, aims to reveal individuals' democratic-libertarian attitude. What is generally observed with this method is that democratic-libertarian attitude of individuals has changed according to socio-political circumstances and their tendencies.

Measuring tolerance is to measure the degree of democratic-liberal attitude to marginal and dissident groups, or generally to political regulation and practice. Naturally, democratic-libertarian attitude level varies with time and conditions, the methods can not be compared to each other. The methods provide an increase in the level of knowledge related to the topic (Gibson, 1992; Sullivan and Hendriks 2009, 385; Schafer and Shaw 2009; 405; Gibson, 2013; 45-68).

2.3. Higher Education And Democratic-Libertarian Attitude

There are three theories about the effect of education on democratic behavior in the literature. According to the first, the civic education theory, education gives individual political skills and also provides the necessary information to understand democracy in terms of principles and practices. According to the research, well trained individuals are better aware of and participate in the political affairs and the functioning of political life (Rosenstone and Hansen, 1993: 136). Education gives the bureaucratic knowledge and skills necessary for participation and therefore reduces the cognitive and material costs of political participation (Wolfinger and Rosenston, 1980). In particular, higher education gives individuals the political attention, talent and knowledge they need in the political world and Individuals can better understand the relationship between political action and the preservation of the existence of the democratic system. (Galston, 2001; Niemi and Junn 1998; Torney-Purta, Schwille, and Amadeo, 1999). Naturally, the impact of the university on democratic behavior will be different in terms of departments. Social departments will develop the political consciousness of the individual more than the other departments (Niemi and Junn, 1998). In short, according to the approach of civic education theory, education increases the knowledge, information and visions of people's political abilities. According to the assumption of the civic education theory, education will create more knowledgeable and corresponding mass of voters.

Social network theory has emerged as a product of experiencing developments that falsifying the civic education theory. In the United States, it was observed that despite the increase in education in the 1960s and after, political interest did not increase (Brody, 1998). The theory of social network explains this as follows: education is an influential factor in determining political interest, but not by increasing skills, but by pointing to what social positions of individuals are. In this respect, education functions as a kind of social classification mechanism in politics. Highly educated people will naturally have a position with higher political impact in society. Since those in lower positions will be located in a relatively ineffective environment, the level of political interest of them will be less. In short, the position within the formal education system will determine the political position (Nie et al., 1996; 17). Naturally, there is a political interaction, integration and joint action amongst those who share these positions. As a matter of fact, it is observed that the political elites have targeted well-educated people at the center of social network and have politically mobilized them (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993; Verba et al., 1995).

The third theory interprets education-politics relations in terms of increasing cognitive skill levels of educated individuals. According to the theory of political meritocracy, differences in the level of political interests and skills of educated individuals are due to differences in intelligence levels, even though they have been trained in the same way. According to this theory, there is a link between education and democratic behavior. Bright students progress and participate more in their schools. According to research, education is a first-rate institution that provides the cognitive ability required by politics (Herrnstein and Murray, 1994; 253). Studies supporting this have been carried out and it has been observed that among the studies conducted among elementary school students, children who are at a higher level intellectually are able to argue in political matters and thus engage in more political participation (Hess and Torney, 1967). This is interpreted as a consequence of the effect of cognitiveness on political behavior (Neumann, 1986: 261).

The theories emphasize that education supports democratic behavior by giving political knowledge and status to individuals in democratic political system. According to the theories, education seriously supports democracy in political institutional sense. On the other hand, this support should also be realized in terms of democratic culture. Therefore, the most important contribution of educated individuals to democracy is to support civil rights and freedoms in all circumstances for all. In other words, if educated individuals become more democratic-libertarian, democracy will be strengthened.

In particular, higher education process allows for a clear and meaningful examination of relationship between education and democratic-libertarian attitude. Because higher education institutions are places where democratic-libertarian values are learned, experienced and reproduced in almost every democratic country.

The longer students stay in school, the more likely they are to be democratic-libertarian and supportive of democratic ethical values. There are several explanations which have been offered to account for this. One is that as a student progresses through an higher education process, there is more exposure to democratic practices like living with different identities, personalities, thoughts and lessons like political science, political history, comparative politics, sociology. In short, higher education not only serves to "liberalize" students by acquainting them with the substance of principles, intellectual thought, and history, but also by making them susceptible to experiences of contrast, contradiction, and disagreement.

The effect of education on democratic-libertarian attitude as tolerance has been revealed by researchers (Nunn, Crockett, and Williams, 1978; Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus, 1982; Jackman, 1978; Jackman and Muha, 1984). There is a linear relationship between education and tolerance (Stouffer 1954; Sullivan et al, 1982; Nunn, Crockett, and William's 1978). Democratic values like tolerance are complex ideas requiring considerable education and social learning before they will be applied (McClosky, 1964). So, through education, individuals become individuals who are cultured, intellectual and more flexible to their own environment (Nunn, Crockett, and William's, 1978). In addition, it has been observed that the political interest of the tolerant ones are high (Prothro & Grigg, 1960; Sniderman et al., 1984).

We can read the support of education to democratic-libertarian attitude from the results of other studies. Ideas that form the basis of democratic-libertarian values can be learned through education (McClosky, 1964; Coenders & Scheepers, 2003). Education make individuals more open to new informations and democratic values (Hyman, Wright, and Reed, 1978-1979). The increase in

education also increases the level of tolerance (Davis, 1975). This positive effect of education on tolerance also functions in the transformation of democracy into practice. Education ensure "greater acquaintance with the logical implications of the broad democratic principles" (Prothro and Grigg, 1960; 291). In the same way, highly educated were more likely to apply general norms of democratic-libertarian thought to groups they disliked (Lawrence, 1976).

There are also studies suggesting that the relationship between education and tolerance is not a linear relationship. Attention is drawn to this issue that the method used can draws us to different conclusions. For example, Jackman argued that less educated tend to be more inclined to give "agree response" for simple and strongly expressed questions than those who are high educated (Jackman, 1973). Educated people tend to be attached to general democratic principles, but they can lose their stance towards specific civil liberties events. So agree-disagree response format can prevent us from seeing the effect of education correctly. It is observed that educated participants theoretically support democratic values, but they can abandon these positions during concrete anti-democratic events (Jackman, 1978). From this point of view it can be said that there is no difference in the democratic behavior of those who are educated and those who are not educated.

A situation that prevents us from being optimistic about support of education to democratic-libertarian attitude, is also observed in the attitudes of individuals towards the individual and collective use of democratic rights. For example highly educated people support democratic values only for individual rights not for group based claims. So, in this way, education functions only as a support for advantaged social status of privileged groups in society (Jackman and Muha, 1984).

One of the factors that prevent us from seeing clearly the effect of education on democratic-libertarian attitude is the method used. The questions asked to educated groups who are certain of political thought can not give an objective measure of democratic-libertarian attitude. For example the questions produced by Stouffer's study asked to leftist educated groups. Naturally the result of the studies, based Stouffer's questions, show that educated people have high commitment to democratic norms than the poorly educated people (Stouffer, 1955; Nunn, Crockett, and Williams, 1978; Davis, 1975). This kind of measuring can not show us general commitment of individuals to democratic norms, so researchers observes an artifactual increase in levels of tolerance (Sullivan, Piereson, and Marcus, 1982).

There are also studies observe that the increase in education does not make individuals more democratic (Sullivan et al, 1982; Bobo & Licari, 1989; Duch and Gibson, 1992). Hierarchical environment (Merelman, 1980) and slogan based education (Zellman and Sears, 1971) in scholls can hamper the formation of democratic character.

Higher education students are prospective elites of society. Their democratic behaviors will be very important for the future of democracy. If they are inconsistent with basic democratic values, democracy will not be based on the rule of law and justice. Therefore, universities must be where the environment of pluralism and cognitive development. If this happens, education can impose democratic values on individuals such as intellectual maturity, openness to new ideas, self-esteem, willingness to take risks, political knowledge and intellectuality (Glock et al., 1975; McClosky and Brill, 1983) and also can make students tolerant by creating a context in which they coexist with differences (Zaller, 1992).

The thesis that universities support democratic behavior is a common finding of modernization theories. Accordingly, in the process of modernization, economic development will affect education

and education will affect democratic behavior (Lipset, 1959). The increase in education level will reveal a society that is democratically better equipped, organized and communicative (Inglehart, 1997: 163). In such a society, individuals' vision of democracy as a tolerant will be based on what Voltaire clearly says that "I do not like what you say, but I will defend your right to say them to death". So we can think of universities as natural places for the development of democratic tolerance or in other word democratic-libertarian attitude.

We used the third of these methods in this study to measure the effect of higher education on democratic-libertarian attitude. The questions are differentiated and organized from (Selvin and Hagstrom, 1960; Davis and Silver, 2004; Davis, 2007). The main target of this study is to measure general democratic-libertarian attitude level of higher education students in the form of democratic-civil liberties support in any political condition.

The data for this research, based on thirteen questions on support for civil rights and liberties, are obtained from Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty of Uludağ University in Turkey. Here, respondents with different political ideas were not questioned about a particular group, but only their general democratic-libertarian attitude levels were tried to be measured.

We can express the basic hypotheses that we will test in the context of these theories that show the effect of the university on democratic tolerance.

H 1: Universities are educational environments where different identities and personalities live together. Time spent in this kind of environment will ensure that values such as mutual recognition and co-operation are acquired. For this reason, time spent at university will lead individuals to become more democratic-libertarian. Accordingly, Class 4 will consist of the most democratic students.

H 2: When considered in the context of modernization theory, university is an ultimate maturation phase of political personality. Universities are the environments where the effects of modern social factors that influence the democratic-libertarian character of political personality can be clearly observed. So, having a political thought, active membership of any club, party or association, family's settlement and value of democracy for an individual are modern social-political indicators that are expected to have meaningful and also positive impact on democratic-liberal attitude (DLA).

H 3: As the success level of the students increases, their self-confidence increases. Self-confidence encourages ethical thinking and the will to express it. For this reason, there is a linear relationship between success and democratic tendency. Accordingly, those with a higher general academic success score (GASS) are more democratic-libertarian.

H 4: Naturally, democratic-libertarian attitude (DLA) may vary according to departments. Departments where social, economic, cultural and political problems are reflected in their programs can be more democratic-libertarian than other departments where the technical knowledge and skills are taught.

H 5: DLA level of students may vary according to preferred sector to work after graduation, private or public. Students who prefer the private sector may be more democratic-libertarian than others, because the public sector needs to be more disciplined, procedural, pro-security. So, those who prefer the private may have higher DLA than those who prefer the public sector.

H 6: DLA level of students may vary according to political thought. Generally, left-wing politics emphasize individuals' democratic-civil rights, liberties and policies, on the other hand, right-wing politics emphasize socio-political order and citizen obligations and duties to state in Turkey. According to this categorization, we can argue that left-wing students have higher DLA than right-wing

students. Here it is necessary to open a parenthesis for liberal democrats. In Turkey, members of this political thought can be regarded as a political line close to the left, because it defends the freedom of individuals against the state and society.

H 7: The significance of the students to the democracy, or the value they give to it, is a sign of democrat and libertarian. So, we can argue that while those who give importance and value to democracy have higher DLA than the others.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Population of the Study and Sample

The population of the study comprised the students in the Economics and Administrative Sciences Faculty of Uludağ University in Turkey. The survey form of the study was directed to 1,389 students which constitute the universe of the study between the dates of 01 March-30 April 2016.

3.2. Data Collection Tools

The survey form is comprised of two parts. In the first part, socio-demographic data form which was consisted of 10 questions, was designed to gather information regarding gender, age, marital status, number of children, department, class, gano, working in a job except of being a student, being a member of any club, party or association, monthly family's total income.

In the second part, democratic-libertarian attitude (DLA) scale with thirteen items developed by Selvin and Hagstrom 1960; Davis, 2007 has been used by adapting to Turkey to measure the democratic-libertarian attitudes of students. Following the format used in previous research, three of the thirteen items (8,9,10) were reverse (r) scored. All respondents were asked to indicate extent of agreement with each statement on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree). The respondents' DLA score is determined by meaning the answers on the 13 DLA. Accordingly, DLA scores below 2,5 indicated students with high DLA, DLA scores between 2,5 and 3 indicated middle DLA and DLA scores above 3 indicated students with low DLA. According to mean score of DLA variable, those scoring below 2,5 on the index coded as 1, those scoring between 2,5 -3 coded 2 and those scoring 3 or above coded as 3. Present research shows that the students' DLA scores changed between 13 (most D) and 57 (least D) and the mean was 36,5527 (standard deviation: 7.93370). In the study, the 325 students (24.8%) are high DLA, the 494 students (37.7%) are middle DLA and 493 (37.6%) are low DLA.

3.3. Analysis of Data

The data were analyzed by using SPSS 13 (The Statistical Package for Social Sciences). Multi-correlation, logistic regression analysis and two-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) were performed. For validity and reliability of DLA which was used in this study, Cronbach's alpha was used. Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.695.

3.3.1. Correlation Analysis for All Variables

Table 1 presents the pearson correlation matrix for the independent and dependent variables of the study.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix For All Measured Variables

Variables	Age	Gender	Marital Status	Number of Children	Department
DLA ort	-,085(**)	-,026	,011	,008	-,040
Sig.(2-tailed)	,002	,336	,690	,773	,149
	Class	General Academic Achievement Score (GAAS)	Working in a job	Active membership of club, party or association	Family's total income
DLA ort	-,098(**)	-,067(*)	,020	,122(**)	-,078(**)
Sig.(2-tailed)	,000	,012	,450	,000	,004
	Family's living region	Family settlement	Preffered sector to work	Political thought	Value of democracy
DM ort	,034	,106(**)	-,035	,301(**)	,053(*)
Sig.(2-tailed)	,210	,000	,193	,000	,049

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

DLA is positively and significantly correlated with active membership of club, party or association, family settlement, political thought and value of democracy and is negatively and significantly correlated with age, class, GASS and family's total income and the correlations were 0,122 ($p<0.01$), 106 ($p<0.01$), 301 ($p<0.01$), 0,053 ($p<0.05$), -0,085 ($p<0.01$), -0,098 ($p<0.01$), -0,067 ($p<0.05$) and -0,078 ($p<0.01$), respectively.

4. FINDINGS

The findings of the study were examined in two sections. In the first section, the sociodemographic characteristics of the respondents were presented and in the second section, the results of the analysis were presented.

4.1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Sociodemographic characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 2. The table presents the distribution of respondents by age, gender, marital status, number of children, department, class, GAAS, working in a job, active membership of club, party or association, monthly family's total income, family settlement, possible job after graduation, political thought and value of democracy.

As seen Table 2, the respondents are 51.8% female and 48.2% male. 78.2% of the students are between 21-30 and 21.6% are 20 or below. Most of the students are single (99.2%) and had no children (99.2%). 28.4% of the students are in public administration, economics 16.7%, labor economics 14.8%, business administration 14.3%, international relations 11.5% and public finance 9.8%.

18.6% of the student are in first class, 19.8% second class, 41.4% third class, and 20.2% fourth class. In terms of GAAS, 37.4% of the students are between 2-2.5 scores and 29.6% are between 2.51 and 2.99 scores. 82% of the students has no work and 18% has a work. 75.8% of the students are not an active member of party, club and association, but 24.2% of the students are an active member. 22.7% of the students' income 501-1000 TL, 43.3% 1000-2,000 TL, and 18.3% 2001-3,500 TL. 51.4% of the students are from marmara region, 12.9 and 11.1 % of the students are from İç Anadolu and Karadeniz. According to the family settlement, 59.4% of students live in a city, 32.9% of students live in a county. While 49.3% of the students want to work at public sector, 36.2% of students want to work at private sector. As to the political thought, 30.4% of students are liberal-democrat, 28.2 % center-right and 25.6% center-left. The students' approaches towards value of democracy, % 62.5 absolutely indispensable, % 27.5 indispensable.

Table 2: Sociodemographic Characteristics

Variables	N	%	Variables	N	%
Age			Gender		
20 or below			Female		
21-30	309	21.6	Male	738	51.8
31-40	1,116	78.2		688	48.2
	3	.2			
Marital Status			Working in a Job		
Single			Yes		
Married	1,416	99.2	No	256	17.9
	11	0,8		1168	81.6
Class			Number of Children		
1			No		
2	193	13,5	1	1415	99.2
3	283	19,8	2	5	.4
4	591	41,4	3	2	.1
5 and above	289	20,2	4 or more	4	.3
	73	5,1		1	.1
Department			Active Membership of Club, Party or Association		
Economics			Yes		
Public Finance	229	16,7	No	344	24,2
Labor Economics	134	9,8		1077	75,8
Business Administration	202	14,8			
Public Administration	196	28,4			
Econometrics	389	4,5			
International Relations	62	11,5			
	157				
Monthly Family's Total			Family's living region		
Income			Marmara		
500 TL and below			Central Anatolia	731	51,4
501-1,000	66	4,7	Mediterranean	183	12,9
1,001-2,000	319	22,7	East Anatolia	96	6,7
2,001-3,500	609	43,3	Aegean	50	3,5
3,501-5,000	258	18,3	Blacksea	140	9,8
5,001 TL and above	107	7,6	Southeastern	158	11,1
	48	3,4	Anatolia	52	3,7
			Abroad	13	,9

Family Settlement			possible job after graduation		
City	846	59,4	Public	699	49,3
County	468	32,9	Private sector	513	36,2
Town	47	3,3	My own business	206	14,5
Village	63	4, ³			
Political thought			value of democracy		
Center-right	331	28,2	Absolutely	877	62,5
Center –left	301	25,6	Indispensable	386	27,5
Liberal-democrat	357	30,4	Indispensable	50	3,6
Radical-right	71	6,0	No idea	83	5,9
Radical-left	114	9,7	Dispensable	7	,5
			Absolutely Dispensable		
Total		100.00	Total		100.00

4.2. DLA Levels of Students

The percentage and mean values of DLA are shown in Table 3. As we see % 42,5 of students with radical left thought has high level DLA, %32,1 mid-level DLA and 25,5 low level DLA (mean: 2,5943). %41.6 of students with center-left thought has high level DLA, % 36,9 mid-level DLA and %21,5 low level DLA. When we look at liberal-democrats, it's seen that 24,8 of students has high level, %37,9 mid-level and %37,3 low level DLA. Unlike left political thought, % 13,5 of the students with center-right political thought has high, %39,3 mid-level and % 47,2 low level DLA. In the same way, it's seen that %10,6 of the students with radical right has high, 36,4 mid-level and % 53 low level DLA. To summarize, when we go from right to left in the table, it's seen that DLA has decreased but mean has increased.

Table 3: DLA according to political thought

DPT						
	Percentage					
Political thought	High	Middle	Low	Mean	Std.Dev.	N.
Radical left	42.5	32.1	25.5	2,5943	,75653	112
Centre-left	41.6	36,9	21,5	2,6135	,59000	292
Liberal-Democrat	24.8	37.9	37.3	2,8769	,51957	351
Center-right	13.5	39.3	47.2	3,0314	,54820	326
Radical right	10.6	36.4	53	3,1333	,48781	70

As seen in the table 3, % 21 of the students in the class 1 have high, 29.3 mid-level and % 49.7 low level DLA. The proportions of students in the class 2 are as follows; %22.3 high, %36.5 mid-level and %41.2 low level DLA. As for the class 3, the proportions of students are as follows; %26.4 have high, %38.7 mid-level and % 34.9 low level DLA. As for the class 4, the proportions of students in the class are as follows; 24.1 high, 42.5 mid-level and %33.5 low level DLA. These findings show clearly that the higher grades of students, DLA has increased.

Table 4: DLA according to class

DPT						
	Percentage					
Class	High	Middle	Low	Mean	Std.Dev.	N.
1.class	21	29.3	49.7	3,0052	,56985	184
2.class	22.3	36.5	41.2	2,9215	,59642	275
3.class	26.4	38.7	34.9	2,8301	,58632	586
4.class	24.1	42.5	33.5	2,8461	,60053	277
5.class and above	34.3	34.3	31.3	2,7669	,61406	72

4.3. Stepwise Regression Analysis

Stepwise regression analysis was used to determine the factors that affect the students' DLA level. Socio-demographic characteristics, political thought and value of democracy were considered as the predictor variables. The significance level was taken as 0,05. The following regression model has been formed to test the effect of all independent variables on the level of students' DLA.

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \beta_4 x_4 + \beta_5 x_5 + \varepsilon_2$$

Table 5: Stepwise Regression Analysis Results of DLA of Student

Model	Predictor Variables	Non Standard beta	Standard beta	T value	P
7	(Constant)	2,460		19,392	,000
	s14deneme	,159	,289	9,851	,000
	Class	-,044	-,077	-2,601	,009
	s9	,111	,081	2,768	,006
	Gano	-,046	-,083	-2,882	,004
	s12	,051	,065	2,264	,024
	Gender	-,096	-,081	-2,659	,008
	s15	,051	,074	2,552	,011
F=21,890; p=,000; R=0,354; R2= 0,125					

Dependent Variable: DLA

Table 5 above demonstrates the stepwise regression analysis carried out to predict the DLA of students. The factors that affect the DLA level explained 12,5% of the variance of the DLA score.

The standardised beta values in Table 5 indicate that political thought, being a member of any club, party or association, family's settlement and value of democracy terms affected in a significant and positive direction DLA with the beta coefficient such as 0.289 ($t=9.851$, $p=.000$), 0.081 ($t=2,768$, $p=.006$), 0,065 ($t=2,264$, $p=.024$) and, 074 ($t=2,552$, $p=.011$) respectively. It is seen that the H2 is supported. According to the results, the students with left political thought, no membership of any

club, party or association, living in a city, see value of democracy indispensable have higher DLA level, than the students with right political thought, a member of a club, party or association, living in a town or a village and see value of democracy dispensable.

Also, the results show that, the direct effects of class, GASS and gender on DLA are negative and significant and the beta values are $-.077$ ($t=-2,601$, $p=.009$), $-.083$ ($t=-2,882$, $p=.004$) and $-.081$ ($t=-2,659$, $p=.008$), respectively. So, when class and GASS are increasing DLA level of students is increasing. In addition, the girls have more DLA level than the boys. As to these results, H1 and H3 are supported.

4.4. Multi-nominal Logistic Regression Analysis

In this section, we explore whether the political thought varies between (1) low, middle vs. and high DLA tendency of student. For this purpose, the logistic regression analysis (a multi-variable statistical technique) was performed to examine the relationships between the dependent and metric independent variables. Logistic regression analysis was preferred instead of other similar methods such as regression analysis and discriminant analysis because of its less stringent assumptions. As known, in a logistic regression analysis, double logistic regression and multi-nominal logistic regression methods are used as the two main methods. First one is used when dependent variables have only two categories and the second one is used if dependent variables have more than two categories. In this paper, multi-nominal logistic regression analysis was preferred because of dependent variables having three categories.

In the multi-nominal logistic regression analysis, for determining the impact of independent variables on dependent variables, high DLA tendency were coded with 1; middle DLA tendency were coded with 2; low DLA tendency were coded with 3.

A. The effect of student's DLA perception

In the logistic regression analysis which was constituted for determining the effect of student's DLA predictor variables on the political thought, -2 log likelihood statistics (LL) was 52,718 and significant level (p) was 0,000 ($p < .05$) with 8 degrees of freedom. The results of goodness-of-fit test, which are shown in table 6, indicated that the logistic regression model was a good fit. The Cox and Snell R^2 was found to be 8.8% in the first step and this statistics indicated that there was an approximately 9% relationship between student's DLA and political thought. Also, Nagelkerke R^2 indicated that there was 9.9% relationship between the above-mentioned variables.

Table 6: Model Fitting Information, Goodness-of-Fit Test of Model and Pseudo R-Square

Model Fitting Information					Goodness- of -Fit				Pseudo R2	
Model	-2 Log Likelihood	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.		Chi-Square	Df	Sig.	Cox and Snell	,088
Intercept only	151,894				Pearson	,000	0		Nagelkerke	,099
Final	52,718	99.176	8	,000	Deviance	,000	0		McFadden	,042

To measure the meaningfulness of independent variable in logistic regression model, likelihood ratio tests were applied. When table 6 is examined, it can be seen that student's political thought is statistically meaningful.

Table 7: Likelihood Ratio Tests

Effect	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests		
	-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi-Square	Df	Sig.
Intercept	52,718(a)	,000	0	.
Political Thought	151,894	99,176	8	,000

After examining the general statistics of model, in the table 8, "B" column shows the coefficients (called Beta Coefficients) associated with each predictor, "sig." column shows the significant levels and "Exp (B)" column shows the odds ratios.

Table 8: The Results of Logistic Regression for DLA According to Political Thought

DP (a)		B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)	95,0% C.I. for EXP (B)	
								Lower	Upper
1,00	Intercept	-1,609	,414	15,110	1	,000			
	Radical left	2,120	,480	19,487	1	,000	8,333	3,251	21,362
	Center left	2,269	,444	26,164	1	,000	9,667	4,053	23,057
	Liberal-democrat	1,200	,438	7,499	1	,006	3,320	1,407	7,835
	Center right	,360	,450	,640	1	,424	1,434	,593	3,465
	Radical right	0(b)	.	.	0
2,00	Intercept	-,377	,265	2,027	1	,155			
	Radical left	,608	,370	2,703	1	,100	1,836	,890	3,790
	Center left	,918	,311	8,717	1	,003	2,503	1,361	4,604
	Liberal-democrat	,394	,294	1,791	1	,181	1,482	,833	2,638
	Center right	,194	,293	,438	1	,508	1,214	,684	2,154
	Radical right	0(b)	.	.	0

a. The reference category is: 3,00.

In the table 8 when the model 1 is examined, it can be seen that student with high DLA are compared to the ones with low DLA has shown that the radical left is 8.333 times, center right is 9.667

times and the liberal-democrat is 3.320 times higher. The Model 2 in which students with medium DLA are compared to the ones with low DLA has shown that center left is 2.503 times higher.

Table 9: Classification Table

		Predicted			
		DLA			
		1,00	2,00	3,00	Percentage Correct
Observed DLA	1,00	161	81	48	55,5%
	2,00	137	124	143	30,7%
	3,00	87	122	178	46,0%
Overall Percentage		35,6%	30,2%	34,1%	42,8%

One can assess the success of the logistic regression by looking at the classification table. In the classification, 55.6% of the students high DLA, 30.7% of the students middle DLA and 46% of the students low DLA. Accurate classification rate of the observation results is 42.8 %.

4.5. The Results of the t-Test and ANOVA

To determine whether there are differences between sociodemographic variables (age, gender, marital status, number of children, department, class, GASS, working in a job, active membership of club, party or association, family's total income, family's living region, family's settlement, preferred sector to work, political thought and value of democracy) and DLA levels, t-test and ANOVA analysis are used and results of the analysis are presented in Table 10.

ANOVA results in Table 10 showed that there are no significant differences in DLA orientations as to gender, marital status, number of children and working in a job.

As to the age of students, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DLA of students who are 20 and below is lower than between 21 and 30 ones.

In respect to the department, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DLA tendency of the students in public finance department is lower than the students in economics department. According to this, a meaningful difference is only between these two departments, so this is not enough to confirm the H4.

In respect to class, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DLA of the students in class 1 is lower than the students in the class 3, 4 and 5. According to this, the H1 is confirmed.

In respect to the GASS, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DLA tendency of the students with low GASS (1, 79 and below) is lower than the students with high GASS (2 and above). According to this result, the H3 is confirmed.

According to active membership of club, party or association, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. T-test shows that DLA tendency of the students with active membership is higher than the students with no membership. According to this, H2 is confirmed.

In respect to family's total income, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DPT tendency the students with 2.000 and below income is lower than the students with 2.001-3.500 TL.

In respect to the family's living region, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DLA tendency of the students living in East Anatolia Region is higher than the students living in Central Anatolia and Blacksea Region.

In respect to family's settlement, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DLA tendency of the students living in a city is higher than the students living in a town and village. According to this, H2 is confirmed.

In respect to preferred sector to work, there is a meaningful difference in DLA. Tukey test shows that DLA of the students who want to be in private sector is higher than the students want to be in public sector and their own business. According to this, the H5 is confirmed.

According to political thought, the center right-wing students and radical right-wing have lower DLA than the center left-wing students, liberal democrat and radical left. The center left-wing students and radical left-wing have higher DLA than the center right-wing students, radical right-wing and liberal democrat. The liberal democrat students have lower DLA than center left-wing students and radical left-wing, but higher DLA than the center right-wing students and radical right-wing. According to this, the H6 is confirmed.

According to value of democracy, the students who see value of democracy as absolutely indispensable, have higher DLA than the students who see value of democracy as indispensable and who said no idea about value of democracy. In addition, the students who have no idea about value of democracy, have lower DLA than the students who see value of democracy as indispensable and dispensable. According to this, the H7 is confirmed.

As a consequence, the results of ANOVA showed that there is significant difference in DLA according to the age, department, class, GASS, active membership of club, party or association, monthly family's total income, family's living region, family's settlement, preferred sector to work, political thought and value of democracy. However, as to the gender, marital status, number of child, working in a job, there were not meaningful difference in DLA.

Table 10: Results of t-test and ANOVA

Variables	DLA					
	N	M	SD	T	F	Sig.
Gender						
Female	722	2,8868	,57459	,963	1.755	.185
Male	669	2,8562	,61207	,960		
Age						
20 and below	298	2,9606	,59136		6.721	0.001
21-30	1092	2,8487	,59142			
31-40	3	2,1047	,19320			
Marital Status						
Single	1381	2,8709	,59268	-,400	1.150	0.284
Married	11	2,9427	,72979	-,326		
Number of Children						
No	1380	2,8719	,59262		1.620	.167
1	5	2,5287	,49085			
2	2	2,1955	,15865			
3	4	3,3077	,92521			
5 and above	1	3,0000	.			
Department						
Economics	216	2,8680	,61677		4.160	0.000
Public Finance	131	3,0786	,64700			
Labor Economics	200	2,8011	,60671			
Business Administration	194	2,8785	,57820			
Public Administration	381	2,8730	,54749			
Econometrics	60	2,9990	,55023			
International Relations	153	2,7909	,56061			
Class						
1	184	3,0052	,56985		4.261	.002
2	275	2,9215	,59642			
3	586	2,8301	,58632			
4	277	2,8461	,60053			
5 and above	72	2,7669	,61406			
GASS						
1.79 ve altı	52	3,1218	,55741		5.315	.000
1.8-1.99 arası	166	2,9082	,58374			
2-2.5 arası	515	2,8745	,58059			
2.51-2.99 arası	410	2,8110	,57244			
3-3.49 arası	196	2,9518	,59426			
3.5 ve üzeri	47	2,6222	,78218			
Working in a Job						
Yes	251	2,8456	,55191	-,756	1.449	.229
No	1139	2,8769	,60249	-,800		

Active membership of club, party or association.						
	336	2,7436	,63062	-4,589	5,650	,018
	1051	2,9131	,57532	-4,378		
Montly family's total income 500 TL and below 501-1,000 1,001-2,000 2,001-3,500 3,501-5,000 5,001 TL and above	64	2,9955	,51061		3.000	0.011
	316	2,9142	,60620			
	591	2,8955	,56826			
	253	2,7594	,64737			
	104	2,8346	,56925			
	48	2,8433	,62169			
Family's living region Marmara Central Anatolia South Anatolia East Anatolia West Anatolia Blacksea South-East Anatolia Abroad	710	2,8390	,61997		3.194	0.002
	180	2,9586	,51829			
	92	2,8896	,62000			
	50	2,6397	,74106			
	137	2,8993	,55613			
	156	2,9924	,51888			
	52	2,7953	,52702			
	13	2,7258	,36056			
Family's settlement City District Town Village	826	2,8135	,59834		7.003	0.000
	456	2,9538	,58159			
	47	2,8757	,64748			
	62	3,0237	,47920			
Preferred sector to work Public sector Private sector My own business	683	2,9147	,56937		6.550	.001
	502	2,7953	,61904			
	200	2,9156	,59359			
Political thought Center right Center left Liberal-democrat Radical right Radical left	326	3,0314	,54820		30.829	.000
	292	2,6135	,59000			
	351	2,8769	,51957			
	70	3,1333	,48781			
	112	2,5943	,75653			
Value of democracy Absolutely indispensable Indispensable No idea Dispensable Absolutely dispensable	862	2,8312	,59462		4.835	.001
	374	2,9358	,53757			
	48	3,1417	,52538			
	81	2,8142	,73696			
	7	2,8571	,98352			

5. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

In this paper we observed democratic-libertarian attitude level of higher education students in Turkey. General opinion that we have arrived that because of democratic-libertarian attitude (DLA) level of students is above the medium, higher education affects DLA level of students positively. The time spend in higher education makes students more democratic-libertarian.

In the social life where students are taken after higher education, in the institutions where they are involved, the determination of the extent to which these qualities are sustained is of interest to other researches. Comparative studies to be made in this regard will be quite functional to understand the role of higher education in democratization process of country. Also this will make possible to discuss politics that could be developed to make higher education more effective for democratization of society. Thanks to comparative analyses to be made between higher education institutions and other social organizations, communities, we can understand clearly democratic contributions of other social institutions. Just another interesting study will be made by considering difference of students' departments in higher education institutions. This could help us to see specifically the effects of department curriculum on liberal democratic attitude. So, we could see the difference between social and humanity sciences' students and physical and medical sciences students. Another important work to be done in this regard will be those who examine the psychological dimension of DLA in Turkish higher education. According to some studies, psychological characteristics like self-esteem, less dogmatic and less authoritarian are more determinative than traditional demographic characteristics such as social status, income, and residence. Level of education achieved also consistently predicts a person's level of DLA. Post-secondary educational experiences in particular may help people become more comfortable with diverse beliefs. These experiences tend to increase self-esteem and to lower dogmatism and authoritarianism. Therefore, examining the subject psychologically will increase our knowledge of the roots of democratic behavior and will give a clear map of what needs to be done politically in Turkey.

REFERENCES

- Adelson, J. (1971). The political imagination of the young adolescent. *Daedalus*, 1013-1050.
- Berelson, Bernard. *Voting: A study of opinion formation in a presidential campaign*. University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Bobo, L., & Licari, F. C. (1989) Education and Political Tolerance: Testing the Effects of Cognitive Sophistication and Target Group Affect. *Public Opinion*, 53 (3): 285-308.
- Brody, Richard (1998). The puzzle of participation in America. In Anthony King (ed.), *The New American Political System*. Washington, DC.: American Enterprise Institute.
- Chandler, C. R., & Tsai, Y. M. (2001). Social factors influencing immigration attitudes: an analysis of data from the General Social Survey. *The Social Science Journal*, 38(2), 177-188.
- Christie, Richard Ed, and Marie Ed Jahoda. "Studies in the scope and method of" The authoritarian personality." (1954).
- Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (2003). The effect of education on nationalism and ethnic exclusionism: An international comparison. *Political psychology*, 24(2), 313-343.
- Davis, D. W., & Silver, B. D. (2004). Civil liberties vs. security: Public opinion in the context of the terrorist attacks on America. *American Journal of Political Science*, 48(1), 28-46.
- Davis, Darren W. 2007. *Negative Liberty: Public Opinion and the Terrorist Attacks on America*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Davis, J. A. (1975). Communism, conformity, cohorts, and categories: American tolerance in 1954 and 1972-73. *American Journal of Sociology*, 81(3), 491-513.
- Davis, J. A. (1975). Communism, conformity, cohorts, and categories: American tolerance in 1954 and 1972-73. *American Journal of Sociology*, 81(3), 491-513.
- Fishkin, James, Kenneth Keniston, and Catherine McKinnon. "Moral reasoning and political ideology." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 27.1 (1973): 109.
- Galston, W. A. (2001). Political knowledge, political engagement, and civic education. *Annual review of political science*, 4(1), 217-234.
- Gibson, J. L. (1992). Alternative Measures of Political Tolerance: Must Tolerance be "Least-Liked"? *American Journal of Political Science*, 560-577.
- Gibson, J. L. (2013). Measuring Political Tolerance and General Support for Pro-Civil Liberties Policies Notes, Evidence, and Cautions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77(S1), 45-68.
- Gibson, J. L., & Bingham, R. D. (1985). *Civil liberties and Nazis: The Skokie free-speech controversy*. New York, Praeger Publishers.
- Gibson, James L., and Amanda Gouws. 2003. *Overcoming Intolerance in South Africa: Experiments in*

- Democratic Persuasion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gibson, L. Gibson, Duch, M. Raymond, Tedin, L. Kent (1992) Democratic Values and the Transformation of the Soviet Union, *The Journal of Politics*, Volume 54, Issue 2 (May, 1992), 329-371.
- Glock, Charles Y., Robert Wuthnow, Jane A. Piliavin, and Metta Spencer (1975) Adolescent Prejudice. New York: Harper and Row.
- Greenstein, Fred I. "Personality and political socialization: The theories of authoritarian and democratic character." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 361.1 (1965): 81-95.
- Greenstein, Fred I. "Political socialization." *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* 14 (1968): 551.
- Greenstein, Fred I. "The benevolent leader revisited: Children's images of political leaders in three democracies." *American Political Science Review* 69.04 (1975): 1371-1398.
- Guérin, D., Petry, F., & Crête, J. (2004). Tolerance, protest and democratic transition: Survey evidence from 13 post-communist countries. *European Journal of Political Research*, 43(3), 371-395.
- Haan, N., Smith, M. B. & Block, J. (1968). Moral Reasoning of Young Adults: Political-social Behavior, Family Background, and Personality Correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10(3), 183-201.
- Haan, Norma, M. Brewster Smith, and Jeanne Block. "Moral reasoning of young adults: Political-social behavior, family background, and personality correlates." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 10.3 (1968): 183.
- Herrnstein, Richard J., and Murray, Charles (1994). *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hess, Robert D., and Torney, Judith V. (1967). *The Development of Political Attitudes in Children*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Hetherington, M., & Suhay, E. (2011). Authoritarianism, threat, and Americans' support for the war on terror. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(3), 546-560.
- Hinckley, R. A. (2010). Personality and political tolerance: The limits of democratic learning in postcommunist Europe. *Comparative Political Studies*, 43(2), 188-207.
- Hyman, Herbert H., and Charles R. Wright (1979) *Education's Lasting Influence on Values*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hyman, Herbert H., Charles R. Wright, and John Shelton Reed (1978) *The Enduring Effects of Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Inglehart, R. (1997). *Modernization and postmodernization: Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Jackman, M. R. (1978). General and applied tolerance: Does education increase commitment to racial integration?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 302-324.
- Jackman, M. R., & Muha, M. J. (1984). Education and intergroup attitudes: Moral enlightenment, superficial democratic commitment, or ideological refinement?. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 49, No. 6 Dec., 751-769.
- Jackman, Mary R. (1973) "Education and prejudice or education and response set?" *American Sociological Review* 38:327-339.
- Knutson, Jeanne Nickell. *The human basis of the polity: A psychological study of political men*. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1972.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104(2), 352-381.
- Lane, R. 1969. *Political Thinking and Consciousness*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Lasswell, Harold D. "Democratic character." *The political writings of Harold D. Lasswell* (1951): 465-525.
- Lasswell, Harold. "The selective effect of personality on political participation." *Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality"*. Glencoe, Ill.: Wiley (1954).
- Lawrence, D. G. (1976). Procedural norms and tolerance: A reassessment. *American Political Science Review*, 70(01), 80-100.
- Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *American political science review*, 53(01), 69-105.
- McClosky, H. (1964). Consensus and ideology in American politics. *American Political Science Review*, 58(02), 361-382.
- McClosky, H. (1964). Consensus and ideology in American politics. *American Political Science Review*, 58(02), 361-382.

- McClosky, H., & Brill, A. (1983). *The dimensions of tolerance: What Americans Believe About Civil Liberties*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Merelman, R. M. (1980) Democratic politics and the culture of American education. *American Political Science Review*, 74(02), 319-332.
- Michael B. Binford, "The Democratic Political Personality: Functions of Attitudes and Styles of Reasoning", *Political Psychology*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Dec., 1983), pp. 663-684 s.670
- Neuman, W. Russel (1986). *The Paradox of Mass Politics: Knowledge and Opinion in the American Electorate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nie, Norman H., Junn, Jane, and Stehlik-Berry, Kenneth (1996). *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Niemi, Richard G., and Jane Junn (1998) *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Nunn, C. A., Crockett Jr, H. J., & Williams Jr, A. J. (1978). *Tolerance for Nonconformity: A National Survey of Changing Commitment to Civil Liberties*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Incorporated Pub,
- Nunn, C. Z., Crockett, H. J., & Williams, J. A. (1978). *Tolerance for nonconformity*. Jossey-Bass Incorporated Pub.
- Pateman, Carole. *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Peffley, M., & Rohrschneider, R. (2003). Democratization and political tolerance in seventeen countries: A multi-level model of democratic learning. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(3), 243-257.
- Petersen, M., Slothuus, R., Stubager, R., & Togeby, L. (2011). Freedom for all? The strength and limits of political tolerance. *British Journal of Political Science*, 41(03), 581-597.
- Postic, Robert. 2011. "Trusting and Tolerating: Finding Ways to Tolerate Each Other." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 1 (December): 79-93.
- Pranger, Robert J. *The eclipse of citizenship: Power and participation in contemporary politics*. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Prothro, J. W., & Grigg, C. M. (1960). Fundamental principles of democracy: Bases of agreement and disagreement. *The Journal of Politics*, 22(2), 276-294.
- Richard M. Merelman, *The Development of Policy Thinking in Adolescence*. *American Political Science Review*, 1971, 65, 1033-1047.
- Richard M. Merelman, *The Dramaturgy of politics*, *The Sociological Quarterly*, Volume 10, Issue 2, pages 216-239, March 1969.
- Riesman, David. *The lonely crowd: A reconsideration in 1960*. 1961.
- Rosenstone, S., & Hansen, J. M. (1993). *Mobilization, participation and democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan.
- Rosenstone, Steven, and Hansen, John Mark (1993). *Mobilization, Participation, and Democracy in America*. New York: Macmillan
- Sarat, Austin. "Support for the legal system: An analysis of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior." *American Politics Quarterly* 3.1 (1975): 3-24.
- Schafer, C. E., & Shaw, G. M. (2009). Trends—Tolerance in the United States. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 73(2), 404-431.
- Simpson, Elizabeth Leonie. "Democracy's Stepchildren. A Study of Need and Belief." (1971).
- Sniderman, P. M. (1975). *Personality and democratic politics*. Univ of California Press.
- Sniderman, P. M., Brody, R. A., & Kuklinski, J. H. (1984). Policy reasoning and political values: The problem of racial equality. *American journal of political science*, 75-94.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1955). *Communism, conformity, and civil liberties: A cross-section of the nation speaks its mind*. Transaction Publishers.
- Sullivan, J. L., & Hendriks, H. (2009). Public support for civil liberties pre-and post-9/11. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 5, 375-391.
- Sullivan, J. L., & Transue, J. E. (1999). The psychological underpinnings of democracy: A selective review of research on political tolerance, interpersonal trust, and social capital. *Annual review of psychology*, 50(1), 625-650.
- Sullivan, J. L., Piereson, J., & Marcus, G. E. (1979). An alternative conceptualization of political tolerance: Illusory increases 1950s–1970s. *American Political Science Review*, 73(03), 781-794.
- Sullivan, John, James Piereson, and George E. Marcus (1982) *Political Tolerance and American Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Tapp, J. L., & Kohlberg, L. (1971). Developing senses of law and legal justice. *Journal of social issues*, 27(2), 65-91.
- Thompson, Dennis F. *The democratic citizen: Social science and democratic theory in the twentieth century*. London: Cambridge UP, 1970.
- Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J. A. (1999). *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA civic education project*. IEA Secretariat, Herengracht 487, 1017 BT, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Verba, Sidney, Schlozman, Lehman, Kay, and Brady, Henry E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wolfinger, R. E., & Rosenstone, S. J. (1980). *Who votes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Zaller, J. (1992). *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*, New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Zellman, G. L., & Sears, D. O. (1971) Childhood origins of tolerance for dissent. *Journal of Social Issues*, 27(2), 109-136.