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ABSTRACT: The purpose of this research is to analyze human rights perceptions within the learning climate and to assess the differences concerning human rights issues among students. Since the aim is to understand students' perceptions, a survey design was employed in this study. In order to collect data the “Taking the Human Rights Temperature Questionnaire” has been adapted into Turkish and applied to 1192 students studying at 41 departments in 10 faculties at Marmara University, Turkey. After mean and item-total scores were computed, series of Analyses of Variance tests were carried out. Scheffé post hoc analyses were applied to see which groups of students are statistically differed from the others. Undergraduate students’ perception has been analyzed statistically, and significant differences have been found regarding sensitivity of students’ perceptions on human rights. According to the research findings, some recommendations have been made to improve of undergraduate students’ understanding and awareness.
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1. INTRODUCTION

“Right” in English, like equivalent words in several other languages, has two central moral and political senses: rectitude and entitlement. Rectitude (righteousness) and entitlement both link “right” and obligation, but in systematically different ways (Donnelly, 2003). Human rights are thus conceived as universal (applicable everywhere) and egalitarian (the same for everyone). These rights may exist as natural rights or as legal rights, in both national and international law (Nickel, 2010). The principle of right is any action is right if it can coexist with everyone’s freedom in accordance with a universal law, or if on its maxim the freedom of choice of each can coexist with everyone’s freedom in accordance with a universal law. With Donnelly (2003)’s words; human rights are equal rights: one either is or not a human being, and therefore has the same human rights as everyone else. They are also inalienable rights: one cannot stop being human, no matter how badly one behaves nor how barbarously one is treated. And they are universal rights, in the sense that today we consider all members of the species homo sapiens “human beings”, and thus holders of human rights.

1.1. Related Literature

According to Shiman (1999), the earliest attempts of literate societies to write about rights and responsibilities date back more than 4,000 years to the Babylonian Code of Hammurabi. This Code, the Old and New Testaments of the Bible, the Analects of Confucius, the Koran, and the Hindu Vedas are five of the oldest written sources which address questions of people’s duties, rights, and responsibilities. Pre-World War II documents, such as the English Bill of Rights, the US Constitution and Bill of Rights, and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen, focused on civil and political rights. To recognise equal dignity to all members of the human family is the strong philosophical and legal nucleus of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 (Postiglione, 2010). Griffin (2010) classified of the human rights approaches as systematic - piecemeal approaches (Kant, Mill, Tasioulas), traditional-modern approaches (Buchanan), and formal-substantive approaches (Forst, Rawls). Griffin’s classification also provide some evidence about development of the human rights concept: First: Kant and Mill have theories of value in general and single highest-level moral principles. Kant (2003) decelerated in the “Metaphysics of Morals” that human have rights the only innate right that need not be acquired and which is internal to human being, is that of freedom. By “freedom” he understands the “independence from being constrained by another’s choice, insofar as it
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1 It can be said that the community of the democratic world of the twentieth century recognized that human rights are object of law and policy. Because, The relationship between the intellectual sense of justice with social justice, developed by Mill and Bentham late 18th century in England, but extant today theory of justice constructed by Rawls (Turner, 2007).
can coexist with the freedom of every other in accordance with a universal law.” This internal and indivisible right is an original right belonging to every man by virtue of his humanity (Buonamano, 2006). The second is Kant (2003)’s remark that our innate right to freedom (as specified by this principle) “belongs to every human being by virtue of his humanity.” Buchanan thinks that equality assumes a special prominence in modern human rights that it lacked in traditional rights. He says, “is that they are egalitarian in at least five respects”: (1) They are ascribed to all persons, (2) they include a robust form of equality before the law, (3) they include social and economic rights that constrain material, and, indirectly, political inequalities, (4) they include rights to political participation for all, and (5) they include strong rights against racial and gender discrimination. International human rights, he says, give us strong rights against discrimination; they rule out any discrimination, formal or informal, private or public, on grounds of gender or race. But that goes much too far. There are all-male and all-female clubs, schools, colleges, and so on some probably even a good thing and none legally or morally prohibited. So Buchanan has not yet identified a way in which modern human rights differ from traditional human rights in their treatment of equality (Griffin, 2010). Rawls acts in accordance with the “natural law" and "social contract" (Rousseau) tradition while putting in the “A Theory of Justice.” He does not interpret this concept of right as providing an analysis of the meaning of the term “right” as normally used in moral contexts. Rawls (2000) says that it is not meant as an analysis of the concept of right in the traditional sense. The brother notion of rightness as fairness is to be understood as a replacement for existing conceptions. There is no necessity to say that sameness of meaning holds between the word “right” (and its relatives) in its ordinary use and the more elaborate locutions needed to Express this ideal contractarian concept of right. So understood one may think of justice as fairness and rightness as fairness as providing a definition or explication of the concepts of justice and right.

Another categorization, offered by Vasak (1977 cited from wikipedia), is that there are three generations of human rights: His divisions follow the three watchwords of the French Revolution: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. First-generation civil and political rights (right to life and political participation), second-generation economic, social and cultural rights (right to subsistence) and third-generation solidarity rights (right to peace, right to clean environment). Out of these generations, the third generation is the most debated and lacks both legal and political recognition. Arendt (1962) differs from this categorization. Arendt’s analysis in The Origins of Totalitarianism2 the conception of human rights “based upon the assumed existence of a human being as such, broke down at the very moment when those who professed to believe in it were for the first time confronted with people who had indeed lost all other qualities and specific relationships except that they were still human. The world found nothing sacred in the abstract nakedness of being human.” Sanders (1991) examines the human rights in three groups as individual rights, group rights, and collective rights3. According to Vincent (2001), there is some warrant, by virtue usage at the United Nations and elsewhere, to distinguish among civil and political rights, economic and social rights, and collective rights. Civil and political rights include the rights to life, liberty, security of the person, privacy and property; the right to marry and found a family; the right to a fair trial; freedom from slavery, torture and arbitrary arrest; freedom of movement and seek asylum: the right to a nationality; freedom of thought, conscience and religion; freedom of opinion and expression; freedom of assembly and association; and the right to free elections, universal suffrage and participation in public affairs. Economic and social rights include the right to work and for a just reward; the right to form and join trade unions; the right to rest and leisure, and to periodic holidays with pay; the right to a Standard of living adequate to health and well-being; the right to social security; education, participation in the cultural life of a community (Vincent, 2001). Collective rights guarantee the development and preservation of ethnic minorities’ cultural identities and forms of organizations. Collective rights have not achieved the level of acceptance accorded to individual rights and also cannot be satisfactorily recognized without the existence of
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3 Individual rights include such group characteristics, prohibiting discrimination, include race, sex, age, political or religious belief, national origin, marital status, sexual orientation, class, language, and disability.
representatives or institutions designed to further a collectivity’s goals, and so individual members of the collectivity play subordinate roles (Sanders, 1991).

Although the concept of human rights has a deep history stretching back to twelfth-century discussions of natural law and natural rights, the human rights movement came into its own as a modern social practice in the mid-twentieth century in the aftermath of World War II. Currently, human rights can be classified in a number of different ways, at an international level the most common categorisation of human rights has been to split them into civil and political rights, and economic, social and cultural rights. Civil and political rights are enshrined on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Economic, social and cultural rights are enshrined on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). Initially, humanity was owe to liberalism for these developments to ended the feudalism. After the feudalism, these developments also triggered capitalist industrial revolution in the process of nation-states. The new social order brought new paradigm for people especially concerning national autonomy, freedom and equal rights (Northcott, 1997). Currently, the human rights movement has been a dynamic and increasingly global one with significant moral, legal, and political dimensions. According to Dudley et al. (1999), arguably, in liberal democratic (in that autonomy, freedom and dignity are protected, and issues of accountability are addressed) polities, human rights are therefore citizenship rights whilst autonomy is central to citizenship in a democratic polity’s words; the various references to a common “human nature” in classical liberal theory occluded the political and social divisions and exclusions introduced by the constitution of modernity. The deconstruction of the essentialism of the subject of human rights has shown the historical and particular character of this most powerful discourse of the universal. And yet the continuous flight of meaning that ever new rights is anchored on a solid ethical residue while the groundlessness of freedom seems to draw its world making power from a moral foundation. The idea that human beings have rights as humans is a staple of contemporary world politics. International conventions, both global and regional, state it, at length and in relations to a large number of rights (Vincent, 2001). And also human rights are a subset of universal moral rights (1) that protect fundamental and general human interests (2) against the intervention, or in some cases nonintervention of (national, regional, or international) public institutions (3). So, human rights are not merely a consequence of individuals’ equal status, but also a way of actually earning that equal status and consolidating it. And through human rights, individuals become actors of their own equality and members of their political community. In the words of Arendt: ‘we are not born equal; we become equal as members of a group on the strength of our decision to guarantee ourselves mutually equal rights’ (Besson, 2011). Vincent (2001) quotes that the subjects of human rights are not members of this or that society, but of the community of humankind. First, the basic qualification for holding human rights is to belong the human race. Secondly, the object of human rights are of great importance. The human right to life may be judged to outrank, in a situation where there is a contest between them, a right under a particular civil law, say, to the use of land. Third, the exercise of human rights might have a more restricted range than that of civil rights. Fourthly, there is the question of the location of the duties that correlate with human rights. In this regards, it has been argued that there are universal human rights in a strong and a weak sense. Rights in the strong sense are held against everybody else. Rights in the weak sense are held against a particular section of humanity. Everyone has a right to life against everyone else: there is a general duty to respect it. Bu if everyone holds, say, economic and social rights, it is against
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4 Belisle and Sullivan (2001)’s words; Human rights are the basic standards human beings need to live life with freedom and dignity. Human rights include fundamental civil and political rights, such as the right to free speech, to freedom of religion, and the right to participate in government. Human rights also include essential economic, social and cultural rights, such as the right to education, to work, and to healthcare.

5 Right refers to what is proper to human beings on account of their humanity; paradoxically partake of a strange timelessness and placelessness.

6 But J. Habermas (1979 quoted from Greene, 1998), who belongs in many respects to the Kantian tradition, offers a possible solution for teaching for justice in what he describes as a theory of “communicative democracy.” The idea is for people to come together without coercion and of their own free will to discuss issues of significance for them.
a particular government: duties are laid only on the responsible authorities. Finally, the justification of human rights moves up one level to regional international law (e.g. the European Convention on Human Rights) or two levels to global international law, so that the appeal is that standards internationally recognized should be met by domestic practice. Thus, human rights have the ability to be principle of justice. So human rights are the recognition of the world-making power of groundlessness; their recognition turns the experience of ontological freedom into a principle of law and politics.

1.2. Research Questions

The concept of international natural rights took place nearly 20th century. Contrary to Turkey the human rights sensitivity has been investigating intensively especially at Europe and United States. At this point, Turkish undergraduate students' perspectives have been able to obtain with international scale which was applied in 12 countries. Based on all these statements, the purpose of this research is to analyze human rights perceptions within the learning climate and to assess the differences concerning human rights issues among students studying at different faculties of Marmara University. The hypothesis is that there should be no significant difference regarding sensitivity to human rights issues among the participating students of different faculties. Following questions also guided as below:

1. What are the evaluation criteria of students concerning human rights issues?
2. Are there any significant differences in these criteria with respect to gender and major?

2. METHOD

Since the aim is to understand students’ perceptions related to human rights, a survey design was employed in this study (Babbie, 1998; Coolican, 1990; Cohen and others, 2005; Karasar, 2011).

2.1. Participants

The sample included 1175 undergraduate students [545 male (46.3%) and 630 female (53.6%)] studying at 41 Departments of 10 different Faculties at Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey. The students who are currently enrolled for this academic year in the University have been randomly chosen in the campus and were asked whether they would be willing to complete a questionnaire. The gender, as well as the faculty distribution of the students participating in the research are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty of Education</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Engineering</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Pharmacy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Technical Education</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Health Sciences</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Law</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Medicine</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 This formulation reveals a certain liberal habit of thought according to which “negative rights”, such as that to liberty, require only an undemanding non-interference, whereas “positive rights”, such as that to education, require substantial provision.
8 e.g. the International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights, and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.
As seen in Table 1, the sample is composed of 1175 students from 10 different faculties. 261 (22.2%) of the participants were enrolled in Faculty of Education; 172 (14.6%) students enrolled in Faculty of Engineering; 149 (12.7%) students enrolled in Faculty of Technical Education; 135 (11.5%) enrolled in Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences; 122 (10.3%) enrolled in Faculty of Medicine; 118 (10%) enrolled in Faculty of Arts and Sciences; 95 (8.1%) enrolled in Faculty of Theology; 44 (3.7%) enrolled in Faculty of Health Sciences; 42 (3.6%) enrolled in Faculty of Pharmacy and 38 (3.2%) enrolled in Faculty of Law. The data were collected from the students of differing years of the study at the university as Table 2.

Table 2: The Distribution Of The Participants By The Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st year</th>
<th>2nd year</th>
<th>3rd year</th>
<th>4th year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 data indicates that 472 (40.2%) of the participants were in their fourth year in the University; 457 (38.9%) of them in their third year, 215 of them in their second year, and 31 of them in their first year of the study.

2.2. Research Instrument

The “Taking the Human Rights Temperature Questionnaire” (THRTQ) developed by Shiman and Palmer (1999) was translated into Turkish and used by the author in this study. The Questionnaire consists of 25 likert type questions with four options where 1 = “no/never”; 2 = “rarely”; 3 = “often” and 4 = “yes/always”. So, the score range of the test varies between 25-100. The THRTQ scale translated into Turkish by three academics working in the field of Education Management and Supervision (1), and Foreign Language Education (2). In order to perform linguistic equivalence, draft Turkish questionnaire applied to 104 students who were studying in the Psychological Counselling Department in Marmara University. Cronbach’s alpha for draft questionnaire was computed after the implementation and it was found as \( \alpha = .867 \). Additionally, item-total correlations was found to be varied between .279 and .498. Adapted questionnaire of THRTQ was implemented to students who were studying in different faculties after this process. The researcher recalculated this values after the data obtained from 1192 undergraduate students. However, 17 questionnaire forms were not taken into assessment due to incomplete data. At the end of factor analysis THRTQ’s cronbach’s alpha was found as \( \alpha = .914 \) (25 items) for 1175 forms. Additionally, item-total correlation was found to be varied between .320 (25th item) and .612 (21th item). Several well-recognized criteria for the factorability of a correlation were used. Firstly, none of the items correlated at least .3 with at least one other item, suggesting unreasonable factorability. Secondly, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .95, above the recommended value of .6, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant \( \chi^2 (300) = 9447.261, p < .000 \). Finally, the communalities were all above .3, further confirming that each item shared some common variance with other items. Given these overall indicators, factor analysis was conducted with all 25 items. Principle components analysis was used because the primary purpose was to identify and compute composite scores for the factors underlying the adapted version of the THRTQ. The initial eigen values showed that the first factor explained 33% of the variance. The second, third and fourth factors had eigen values of just over one, each factor explaining 6%, 6% and 4% respectively. The one factor solution, which explained 33% of the variance, was preferred because of its previous theoretical support, the “leveling off” of eigen values on the scree plot after the
first factor, and the insufficient number of primary loadings and difficulty of interpreting the second factor and subsequent factors.

2.3. Data Analysis

The data analyses were performed by using SPSS 17.00 statistical computing program. Firstly, the mean and total scores for the responses for THRTQ by the participants were computed. The items with the highest and the lowest means were detected for interpretation. Then, series of Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) tests were carried out. Finally, Scheffé post hoc analyses were applied to see which groups of students are statistically differed from the others.

3. FINDINGS

According to descriptives (appendix 1), the most highly rated five questions are as follows; 3rd, 9th, 13th, 14th, 20th. On the other hand, the most lowly rated five questions also are as follows; 2nd, 4th, 6th, 16th, 24th. After the descriptives, in order to investigate the effect of gender on the THRTQ scores that one-way ANOVA was applied to the data. The results can be seen at Table 3.

### Table 3: Summary Of ANOVA Results For The Effect Of Gender On THRTQ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>211,1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>211,1</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>0.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>220474,7</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>191,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>220685,8</td>
<td>1154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of variance showed that the effect of gender on THRTQ scores was not statistically significant, F(1,1153) = 1.104, p = .294. This results show us there is no significant differences between female (N=628, \( \bar{X} = 66.46, SD = 14.32 \)) and male (N=544, \( \bar{X} = 65.64, SD = 13.11 \)) on THRTQ scores. To investigate the effect of the type of faculty that students were enrolled on the THRTQ scores, a one-way ANOVA was applied to the data. The results can be seen at Table 4.

### Table 4: ANOVA Results For The Effect Of The Type The Faculty On THRTQ Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>23189,37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2576,60</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>185975</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>164,43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>209164,4</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p < .001.

Analysis of variance showed that the type of faculty that students were enrolled on THRTQ scores was statistically significant, F(9,1131) = 15.67, p = .000, p < .001. According to this results, there are significant differences between the students who are enrolled to different types of faculties. At this point post-hoc analyses (Scheffé) were applied to see which faculty student groups are statistically different the others. The results for two faculties (Technical Education Faculty and Faculty of Theology) that have the highest scores and significantly different from most of the other faculties were presented: Scheffé post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the students who were enrolled to Faculty of Technical Education (\( \bar{X} = 63.96, SD = 13.37 \)) are significantly different than the students who were enrolled to Faculty of Education (\( \bar{X} = 62.29, SD = 14.34, p=.000 \)); Faculty of Engineering (\( \bar{X} = 64.67, SD = 12.56, p=.000 \)); Faculty of Pharmacy (\( \bar{X} = 62.53, SD = 13.05, \))
p=.000); Faculty of Law ($\bar{X}= 63.76$, SD = 11.18, p=.000); Faculty of Medicine ($\bar{X}= 61.26$, SD = 10.06, p=.000); Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences ($\bar{X}= 63.96$, SD = 11.58, p=.000); Faculty of Arts and Sciences ($\bar{X}= 65.31$, SD = 14.60, p=.000) and the students who were enrolled to Faculty of Health Sciences ($\bar{X}= 67.84$, SD = 13.32, p=.049). A Similar results were obtained for the Faculty of Theology which is the one with students who have the second highest THRTQ scores. Post hoc analyses using the Scheffé post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the students who were enrolled to Faculty of Theology ($\bar{X}= 63.96$, SD = 13.37) are significantly different than the students who were enrolled to Faculty of Education ($\bar{X}= 62.29$, SD = 14.34, p=.000); Faculty of Engineering ($\bar{X}= 64.67$, SD = 12.56, p=.006); Faculty of Pharmacy ($\bar{X}= 62.53$, SD = 13.05, p=.026); Faculty of Medicine ($\bar{X}= 61.26$, SD = 10.06, p=.000); Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences ($\bar{X}= 63.96$, SD = 11.58, p=.003) and the students who were enrolled to Faculty of Arts and Sciences ($\bar{X}= 65.31$, SD = 14.60, p=.042). On the other hand, it was found that there is no statistically significant difference between the other Faculties. To investigate the effect of the years in the university by the THRTQ scores one-way ANOVA was applied to the data. For this analyses, the students who are at their first year of study were eliminated from the analyses because of possible low representativeness (N=31 and 21 of them study in Faculty of Technical Education). So the analysis was conducted for the students who are at their second, third and fourth and more years of study in the university. The results were presented in Table 5.

**Table 5: ANOVA Results For The Effect Of The Years Of The Study On THRTQ Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2281.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1140.65</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>206883.05</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>181.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>209164.35</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

Analysis of variance showed that the effect of years of study in the university on THRTQ scores were statistically significant, F(1,1138) = 6.27, p = .002, p < .01. This results shows that there are significant differences between the students who are at their second years of university, and the ones who are at their third and fourth year of university. Scheffé post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the students who are in their fourth and more years in the university (M = 63.96, SD = 13.37) are less sensitive to human rights than in the students who are in their second years (M = 67.14, SD = 13.04, p=.017) and in their third years (M = 66.14, SD = 13.04, p = .011) in the university. One additional noteworthy information to reader is that eliminated group of students from this analysis who are at their first year of study have the highest score group among the participants (N=31, M=83.81, SD=10.10). As an indication of external validity proof, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Pearsons’s’) was computed between THRTQ total scores and Human Rights Education Attitude (HERAS) subscales (Karaman, 1999), namely Human Rights Education (HRE) and Human Rights in Education Settings (HRES). These two questionnaires which were delivered together for external validity study, were applied to the 50 undergraduate students who didn’t get the THRTQ previously for the original study. The results were summarized in the Table 6.

**Table 6: The Correlation Between HERA and THRTQ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HRE</th>
<th>HRES</th>
<th>THRTQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HRE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(49)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
According to the results, there is no statistically significant relationship between HRE Subscale and THRTQ ($r = 0.080, n = 49, p > 0.05$). On the other hand, there is a statistically significant negative relationship between HRES Subscale and THRTQ ($r = -0.322, n = 49, p < 0.05$). In other words, the more "Human Rights in Education Settings" subscale shows upward tendency, the less "THRTQ" shows a declining tendency or vice versa.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Analyzing human rights issues within the learning climate is important for developing an action plan and improving human rights. The picture of undergraduate students' understanding and perceptions concerning human rights issues through a national empirical perspective has interesting findings. The first question in the study was "what are the evaluation criteria of the undergraduate students on human rights?" According to the descriptive results, the highest average items can be interpreted as often encountered situations by students. Especially 14th item seems to possess the highest average: “My school community welcomes students, teachers, administrators, and staff from diverse backgrounds and cultures, including people not born in Turkey ($\bar{X} = 3.24$),” and it can be interpreted as often encountered situation by students. The other conditions and their descriptives frequently encountered by students are as follows: “My personal space and possessions are respected ($\bar{X} = 2.99$),” “Institutional policies and procedures are implemented when complaints of harassment or discrimination are submitted ($\bar{X} = 2.88$),” “Members of my school have the right to form associations within the school to advocate for their rights or the rights of others ($\bar{X} = 2.83$),” “Members of the school community are not discriminated against because of their lifestyle choices, such as manner of dress, associating with certain people, and non-school activities ($\bar{X} = 2.80$).” It is highly noteworthy for us that these five items have common point concerning to discrimination theme. On the other hand, the lowest average items can be interpreted as rarely encountered situations by students. Especially 6th item seems to possess the lowest average: “When someone demeans or violates the rights of another person, the violator is helped to learn how to change his/her behavior ($\bar{X} = 2.09$)” and it can be interpreted as rarely encountered situation by students. This result also can be interpreted as "students are not often faced with violence in school” so 1st item’s descriptive result (2.74) may confirm this statement. Other situations encountered rarely by students are as follows: The other conditions and their descriptives rarely encountered by students are as follows: “All students receive equal information and encouragement about academic and career opportunities ($\bar{X} = 2.10$),” “employees in my school are paid enough to have a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being (including housing, food, necessary social services and security from unemployment, sickness and old age) of themselves and their families ($\bar{X} = 2.35$).” it is also highly noteworthy for us that these items have common point concerning to socio-economic conditions and equality of opportunity. The findings overlap with Dündar (2011)'s study which emphasized the problematic functioning of equality of opportunity in Turkey. The second question of the study was “are there any significant differences in these criteria with respect to gender and major?” Analysis of variance showed that THRTQ scores were statistically significant [$F(9,1131) = 15.67, p = .000, p < .001$] according to the faculty that students were enrolled. Especially two faculties (Technical Education Faculty and Faculty of Theology) have the highest scores and were identified as significantly different from most of the other faculties. According to these findings it is suggested that there are two main group of faculties in terms of their scores on THRTQ. The first group that composed of highest score faculties includes Faculty of Theology and Faculty of Technical Education and the second group is composed of the rest of the
participating faculties. There were statistically significant intergroup differences but no intragroup differences between these two main groups. At this point the research hypothesis is statistically invalid (H0) as well. In other words, there are significant differences regarding to human rights sensitivity between the different faculties’ findings. This result overlaps with Gündoğdu (2011)’s findings which found significant relationships between ratings for attitudes about human rights education and gender, department, university, and university’s geographical region. But opposite to Gündoğdu (2011)’s findings, the findings of this research show that gender has no significant influence on human rights sensitivity \[F(1,1153) = 1.104, \text{p} = .294\]. Nava and others (2005), Torney-Purta and others (2008), and Goldberg (2008) could find no significant differences between male and female responses in terms of human rights attitudes as well. But we should still consider the effects of the other factors such as ethic, environment, and education as suggested by Postiglione (2010), Heyneman (2004), Plantilla (2002), McLaughlin (2005), Redondo (2009), Besson (2011), Gillespie and Melching (2010), Dudley et al. (1999), Flowers, Bernbaum, Rudelius-Palmer and Tolman (2000). According to THRTQ scores, another unexpected finding related to effect of years of study in the university was that there were significant differences among the students’ perceptions who were in their second, third and fourth years in the university. It was observed that although years of study in the university advanced, sensitivity to human rights decreased. This result shows the importance of Karaman-Kepenekçı (1999)’s findings, which states the need for a human rights course for undergraduate students. As Andreopoulos and Claude (1997), and Gundogdu (2011) claimed, colleges and universities are critically important in initiating human rights efforts. Thus it is important to understand how human rights education is perceived by undergraduate students, as they represent the most strategic group in society, who will teach new generations of young citizens in schools in the future. Finally, the findings of this research can be seen as a step toward clarifying the meaning of “human rights” for undergraduate students in Turkey. According to these findings, it is certainly suggested that the studies on human rights issues concerning undergraduate students should be increased, and a course on human rights issues should be offered as an elective course. In Moghaddam and Vuksanovic (1990)’s words; the achievement would be facilitated through a better understanding of peoples’ actual attitudes and behaviors towards human rights.
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**Geniş Özet**

sonuç, okul yılı de keninin insan hakları hazırken, insan hakları anlayışının insan hakları karşılaştırılmasında hem de üniversite öğrencilerinin bakış açılarına ilişkin bir profil elde edilmesi mümkün olmuştur. Böylece bu araştırmının amacı, üniversite öğrencilerinin insan hakları hususuna ilişkin algılarını incelemektir. Belirtilen kişiler, Kita Avrupa’sı ve Amerika’da yoğun olarak araştırmalar konuya ilişkin çalışmada, özellikle ulusal ve uluslararası karşılaştırılmalara olan vermesi açısından yabancı bir ólçek kullanılmıştır. Bu doğrultuda Marmara Üniversitesi’nde farklı fakültelerde (41) öğrencilerin devam etme olanağı, öğrenciler, öğrencimiz ortamlarında insan hakları ilişkin değerlendirmeleri analiz edilmiştir. Çalışmanın alt amaçları: (1) öğrencilerin insan haklarına ilişkin değerlendirme kriterlerinin ne olduğu, ve (2) bu kriterlere ilişkin cinsiyet ve fakülte (alan) bazında anlamlı bir farklılığın olup olmadığını. Veriler, Türkiye’ye “İnsan Hakları Hassasiyet Öğçesi” olarak adı verilen ölçek olarak elde edilmiştir. Ölçek, ilk etapta üç ayrı uzman tarafından Türkçe’ye çevrilmiş, Türkçe’si konusuna uzaıştıran varılan maddelerden oluşan aday ölçek formu, Marmara Üniversitesi Psikolojik Danışmanlık ve Rehberlik Bölümü’nde okuyan 104 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır. Bu uygulamada dilsel eşdeğerlik değerleri için α=.867, item-total korelasyon değerlerinin .279 and .498 arasında değiştiği görülmüştür. Bu değerlendirme yorumlamaya imkan verdiğini görmüştür. Öğrenci, Marmara Üniversitesi’nde 10 fakültenin 41 bölümünde eğitime devam eden toplam 1192 öğrenciye uygulanmıştır. Toplam 1175 adet form değerlendirmeye alınmış, eksik ya da hatalı doldurulduğu görülün 17 adet form değerlendirilme dahil edilmiştir. 1175 verinin faktör analizi sonuçlarına göre ölçeğin α değeri .914 (25. madde), item-total korelasyon değerlerinin .320 (25. madde) ve .612 (21. madde) arasında değiştiği tespit edilmiştir. Yapi geçeriğini sınımlama yöntemi Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (.95) ve Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity sonuçlarının (χ² (300) = 9447.261, p <.000) istatistiksel olarak p<0.01 düzeyinde anlamlı olduğu belirlenmiştir. 10 fakültenin 41 farklı bölümünde öğrenimin gerçekleştikten sonra 1175 öğrencinin 545 (%46.3)’ü erkek, 630 (%53.6)’ı bayandır. Üniversite öğrencilerinin cevaplarında ilişkin varyans analizi ([ANOVA) ve Scheffé post hoc analiz)] sonuçlarına göreسكان hakları hassasiyetine ilişkin anlamlı farklılıklıklar bulunmaktadır.


Araştırmının ilk sonuçu, fakülteler arasında insansı hakları hassasiyetine ilişkin anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmaktadır. İkinci sonuç ise, cinsiyet ve bölüm değişkenlerinin insan hakları hassasiyeti üzerinde anlamlı bir etkisinin bulunmamasıdır. Araştırmı sırasında beklenmeyen diğer bir sonuç, okul yılı değişkeninin insan hakları hassasiyeti olan etkisine ilişkidir. Elde edilen sonuçlara
göre, okul yılı artıkça insan hakları hassasiyeti azalmaktadır. Diğer bir ifadeyle öğrenciler üniversitenin ilk yıllarında insan hakları konusunda daha hassas görünmektedirler. Bu sonuç, aynı zamanda yükseköğretim kademesinde insan hakları eğitimine olan ihtiyacı dile getiren araştırmaların bulgularının önemini işaret etmektedir. Sonuç olarak bu araştırmada, öğrencilerin insan hakları hassasiyetine ilişkin farkındalıklarını ve anlayışlarını geliştirmeye yönelik uygulamaları ağırlık verilmesi gerektiğini vurgulanarak, ettiği de içine alan bu konuda üniversite yıllarının önemine dikkat çekilmiş, birlikte yaşama kültürünün gelişmesine katkıda bulunması açısından insan haklarına hassasiyeti artıracak seçmeli derslerin konulması önerilmiştir.