Table 4 Levels of Learner Autonomy Supportive Behaviors of Primary school teachers

Items of Autonomy Supportive Levels	Always		Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never		Mean	SD
	N	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
To approach students with empathy (placing yourself in their shoes).	302	56.2	204	38	23	4.3	3	0.6	5	0.9	1.52	0.69
To allow students to express their learning problems.	394	73.4	128	23.8	7	1.3	3	0.6	5	0.9	1.32	0.62
To share the feelings and thoughts of the students regarding all kinds of choices (activity, material, method, etc.) in the learning process.	295	54.9	215	40	19	3.5	3	0.6	5	0.9	1.53	0.68
To share students' feelings and thoughts about their learning.	352	65.5	153	28.5	24	4.5	3	0.6	5	0.9	1.43	0.69
To encourage students to do extra-curricular studies (research, reading, projects, etc.) to improve their learning.	357	66.5	147	27.4	25	4.7	3	0.6	5	0.9	1.42	0.69
To provide students with feedback on their learning.	397	73.9	130	24.2	2	0.4	3	0.6	5	0.9	1.30	0.60
To encourage students to ask questions in the lessons.	440	81.9	87	16.2	2	0.4	8	0	0	8	1.5	0.60
To encourage students to self-use (authentic) real-life materials outside of the classroom.	329	61.3	178	33.1	19	3.5	5	0.9	6	1.1	1.47	0.71
To ensure that students receive help from individuals outside the classroom (mother, father, an expert, etc.) to support their learning.	313	58.3	140	26.1	68	12.7	10	1.9	6	1.1	1.61	0.86

To support students to carry out independent studies (practice, repetition, reading, summarizing, etc.) in the classroom by themselves.	368	68.5	129	24.0	31	5.8	3	0.6	6	1.1	1.42	0.73
To collaborate with students' families on issues associated with the learning process.	411	76.5	104	19.4	14	2.6	0	0	8	1.5	1.31	0.67
To help students in setting learning goals.	353	68.7	149	27.7	21	3.9	8	1.5	6	1.1	1.45	0.74
To allow students to assess each other's work.	254	47.3	202	37.6	69	12.8	9	1.7	3	0.6	1.71	0.80
To share student assessments of their learning.	303	56.4	191	35.6	34	6.3	3	0.6	6	1.1	1.54	0.74
To support their participation in decisions about measurement and assessment.	270	50.3	197	36.7	64	11.9	3	0.6	3	0.6	1.64	0.75
To allow students to assess their own works.	303	56.4	173	32.2	48	8.9	3	0.6	10	1.9	1.59	0.82

It is seen in Table 4 that the mean score of the primary school teachers for exhibiting the behaviors of supporting learner autonomy is 1.47, whereas the total score value is 23.48. It is observed that primary school teachers have a low level of exhibiting behaviors of supporting learner autonomy.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 5 Bilateral Relationships among Variables

	Exhibiting	Planning	Decision-making	Professional Development
Exhibiting	-	-	-	-
Planning	.01	-	-	-
Decision-making	-.05	.76**	-	-
Professional Development	.08	.52**	.67**	-

**p<.01

Exhibiting learner autonomy supportive behaviors and planning (r=.01, p>.05), making decisions about educational programs (r=-.05, p>.05), as well as professional development (r=.08, p >.05) were not found to be significantly related.

Table 6 Findings Regarding the Prediction of Exhibiting Learner Autonomy Supportive Behaviors

	B	*SH B*	*β*	*t*
Planning	.08	.06	.09	1.43
Decision-making	-.67	.20	-.25	-3.29*
Professional development	.36	.11	.19	3.38*
R^2		03		
Adjusted R^2		.02		

*p<.05

The model for predicting learner autonomy supportive was found to be significant (*F(3, 533)= 4.99, p<.05*). Among the dimensions of autonomy; decision-making about educational programs (*B=-.67, t=-3.29, p<.05*) and professional development (*B=.36 t=3.38, p<.05*) contribute significantly. A one-unit increase in teachers' decision-making levels regarding educational programs predicts a .67-unit decrease in exhibiting learner autonomy supportive behaviors. A one-unit increase in teachers' professional development levels predicts an increase of .36 units. The model explains 2% of the variance of exhibiting learner autonomy supportive behaviors.

CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION and SUGGESTIONS

The present study investigated the relationship between the levels of primary school teachers' autonomy and learner autonomy supportive behaviors. To this end, a response was sought to the question "What is the level of primary school teachers' autonomy in the process of realizing the teaching profession?" in the first place. It was determined that the mean score of teachers' autonomy was 3.60, whereas the total score value was 64.81. The level of primary school teachers' autonomy is seen to be at a medium level.

Secondly, an answer was sought to the question "What are the levels of school teachers' learner autonomy supportive behaviors?" and the mean score of the primary school teachers' learner autonomy supportive behaviors was determined as 1.47, whereas the total score value was 23.48. It is observed that the level of exhibiting learner autonomy supportive behaviors of primary school teachers is low.

Lastly, the question "Does the autonomy levels of classroom teacher candidates significantly predict levels of their learner autonomy supportive behaviors?" was tried to be answered. Exhibiting learner autonomy support behaviors, planning and implementing instruction (r=*.01, p>.05*), making decisions regarding educational programs (*r=-.05, p>.05*), and professional development (*r=.08, p >.05*) were not found to be significantly related. The model in predicting learner autonomy supportive behaviors was found to be significant (*F(3, 533)= 4.99, p<.05*). Among the dimensions of autonomy; decision-making regarding educational programs (*B=-.67, t=-3.29, p<.05*) and professional development (*B=.36 t=3.38, p<.05*) contribute significantly. A one-unit increase in teachers' decision-making levels about educational programs predicts a .67-unit decrease in exhibiting learner autonomy supportive behaviors. A one-unit increase in teachers' professional development levels predicts an increase of .36 units. The model explains 2% of the variance of exhibiting learner supportive autonomy behaviors. In the study conducted by Ataşbaş (2017), the relationship between teacher autonomy and the level of behaviors supporting learner autonomy, consistent with the findings of this research, emerged as a significant yet moderately negative predictive model, unlike the high levels observed in this study. In a study by Yazıcı (2016), the relationship between teachers' autonomy levels and behaviors supporting learner autonomy was found to be in the same direction and at a moderate level. This study is the third in Türkiye to explore the relationship between these two variables. Ataşbaş (2017) explained a similar outcome in his study through systemic patterning, attributing it to teachers feeling confined within certain patterns and perceiving themselves as curriculum guards due to rigid inspection systems. The existence of a comprehensive checklist proposal for transitioning to positive educational practices (Seligman and Adler, 2019) supports Ataşbaş's statements. A paradigm shift in education may be possible by integrating all components of the system with this paradigm. Although the autonomy levels of classroom teachers may be higher with the contribution of the specific context of their fields (Buyruk and Akbaş, 2021), a paradigm shift is needed throughout the system for it to contribute to behaviors supporting student autonomy. In a system shaped by a centralist understanding (Karatay, Günbey, and Taş, 2020; Buyruk and Akbaş, 2021), an increase in teacher autonomy may not lead to the enrichment of educational processes supporting student autonomy but rather a shift of power towards teachers from school management. Scientific studies show that a positive educational environment that supports student autonomy increases students' achievements and well-being (Cheon, Reeve, Vansteenkiste, 2020). However, achieving such a positive

educational environment requires the restructuring of all components of education, as seen in practical applications (Seligman and Adler, 2019). It can be said that the results of the research align with these realities.

Future studies can be conducted with different populations and samples to measure levels of autonomy and autonomy supportive behaviors. Furthermore, only a quantitative research method was employed in the present study. By carrying out new studies, it would be possible to employ qualitative research methods in these studies and to conduct mixed-pattern research studies.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed by the authors with respect to the research, authorship, or publication of this article.

Ethics Approval

The formal ethics approval was granted by the Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee of Ege University.

Funding

No specific grant was given to this research by funding organizations in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Research and Publication Ethics Statement

The study was approved by Institute of School of Educational Sciences of Ege University, Türkiye (Approval Number. 39262). The study will not cause any mental or physical harm to the subjects and will not compromise their safety and right. "Examination of The Relationship Between Levels of Primary School Teachers' Autonomy and Their Learner Autonomy Supportive Behaviors" the following is fulfilled:

- This material is the authors' own original work, which has not been previously published elsewhere.
- The paper reflects the authors' own research and analysis in a truthful and complete manner.
- The results are appropriately placed in the context of prior and existing research.
- All sources used are properly disclosed.

Contribution Rates of Authors to the Article

Writing-Review & Editing: Mehmet Uğur Kutluer; Project Administration: Associate Professor Aylin Mentiş

REFERENCES

Adler, A. (2017). Well-Being and academic achievement: Towards a new evidence-based educational paradigm. *Future directions in well-being: Education, organizations and policy*, 203–208. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-56889-8_35

Alvi, M. (2016). *A manual for selecting sampling techniques in research.*

Ataşbaş, R. (2017). *An analysis of the effect of teacher autonomy on supporting learner autonomy* [Master's thesis, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü].DSpace@GAÜN.https://acikbilim.yok.gov.tr/handle/20.500.12812/129401

Bailey, F., & Pransky, K. (2005). Are "Other people's children" constructivist learners too? *Theory into Practice, 44*(1), 19-26. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4401_4

Bao, X., & Lam, S. (2008). Who makes the choice? Rethinking the role of autonomy and relatedness in Chinese children's motivation. *Child Development, 79*(2), 269–283. Portico. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2007.01125.x

BEST. (2021, July 10). Erişim adresi https://dropoutprevention.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/07/paquetteryanwebquest_20091110.pdf

Brooks, J. G., & Martin G. Brooks (1999). *In Search of Understanding: The Case for Constructivist Classrooms.*

Buyruk, H., & Akbaş, A. (2021). An analysis on the relationship between teachers' occupational professionalism and their autonomy. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, *46*(208), 1-21. http://dx.doi.org/10.15390/EB.2021.9996

Büyüköztürk, Ş., Kılıç Çakmak, E., Erkan Akgün, Ö., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık. https://doi.org/10.14527/9789944919289

Cheon, S. H., Reeve, J., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2020). When teachers learn how to provide classroom structure in an autonomy-supportive way: Benefits to teachers and their students. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 90*, 103004. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.103004

Constructivism (2021). Knowledge is a process of discovery: How constructivism changed education. The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/knowledge-is-a-process-of-discovery-how-constructivism-changed-education-126585

Cook, J. (1992). Negotiating the curriculum: Programming for learning. *Negotiating the curriculum: Educating for the 21st century*, 15-31.

Çankaya, Z. C. (2009). Autonomy support, basic psychological need satisfaction and subjective well-being: Self- determination theory. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 4*(31), 23-31.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior.* Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). *Handbook of self-determination research.* Rochester: University of Rochester Press.

Deci, E., Vallerand, R., Pelletier, L., & Ryan, R. (1991). Motivation and education: The self-determination perspective. *Educational Psychologist, 26*(3), 325–346. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep2603&4_6

Driver, R. (1988). Theory into practice II: A constructivist approach to curriculum development. In P. Fensham (Ed.), *Development and dilemmas in science education* (pp. 133-149). London: The Falmer Press.

Ergüner Tekinalp, B., & Işık, Ş. (2019). *Eğitimde pozitif psikoloji uygulamaları.* Ankara: Pegem.

Eryılmaz, A., & Bek, H. (2018). Development of the positive teacher scale from the perspective of teachers. *Kastamonu Üniversitesi Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.24106/kefdergi.369825

Grolnick, W. S., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). Autonomy in children's learning: An experimental and individual difference investigation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(5), 890–898. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.5.890

Von Glasersfeld, E. (1989). Cognition, construction of knowledge, and teaching. *Synthese, 80*(1), 121–140. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00869951

Güngör, A. (2017). Understanding Positive Psychology in Education. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 15*(2), 154-166.

Halliday, A. J., Kern, M. L., Garrett, D. K., & Turnbull, D. A. (2019). Understanding factors affecting positive education in practice: An Australian case study. *Contemporary School Psychology, 24*(2), 128–145. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40688-019-00229-0

Jang, H., Kim, E. J., & Reeve, J. (2012). Longitudinal test of self-determination theory's motivation mediation model in a naturally occurring classroom context. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 104*(4), 1175–1188. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028089

Karasar, N. (2019). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi.* (34. Basım). Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.

Karatay, M., Günbey, M., & Taş, M. (2020). The relationship between teacher professionalism and autonomy. *Munzur Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 9*(2), 173-195.

Kasser, T., & Ryan, R. M. (1996). Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*(3), 280–287. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167296223006

Knoop, H. H. (2020). How positive psychology can revitalize education?. *Positive Psychological Science: Improving Everyday Life, Well-Being, Work, Education, and Societies Across the Globe.*

Kristjánsson, K. (2012). Positive psychology and positive education: Old wine in new bottles? *Educational Psychologist, 47*(2), 86–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2011.610678

Kutluer, M. U., & Mentiş Köksoy, A. (2020). Positive education and self-determination theory: A review of implementations and influences. In H. Şahin (Ed.), *Educational Science Theory, Current Researches and New Trends* (pp. 195-208). Cetinje; Montenegro: Ivpe.

Niemiec, C. P., & Ryan, R. M. (2009). Autonomy, competence, and relatedness in the classroom. *Theory and Research in Education, 7*(2), 133–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/1477878509104318

Noble, T., & McGrath, H. (2015). PROSPER: A new framework for positive education. *Psychology of Well-Being, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13612-015-0030-2

Oades, L. G., Robinson, P., Green, S., & Spence, G. B. (2011). Towards a positive university. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 6*(6), 432–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2011.634828

O'Brien, C. (2012). Sustainable happiness and well-being: Future directions for positive psychology. *Psychology, 03*(12), 1196–1201. https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2012.312a177

Oğuz, A. (2013). Developing a scale for learner autonomy support. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice.* https://doi.org/10.12738/estp.2013.4.1870

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., & Perry, R. P. (2002). Positive emotions in education. *Beyond Coping*, 149–174. https://doi.org/10.1093/med:psych/9780198508144.003.0008

Peters, D., Calvo, R. A., & Ryan, R. M. (2018). Designing for motivation, engagement and wellbeing in digital experience. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00797

Easley, J. A., Piaget, J., & Rosin, A. (1978). The development of thought: Equilibration of cognitive structures. *Educational Researcher, 7*(11), 18. https://doi.org/10.2307/1175382

Reeve, J., Jang, H., Carrell, D., Jeon, S., & Barch, J. (2004). Enhancing students' engagement by increasing teachers' autonomy support. *Motivation and Emotion, 28*(2), 147–169. https://doi.org/10.1023/b:moem.0000032312.95499.6f

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Self-determination theory and the role of basic psychological needs in personality and the organization of behavior. In O. P. John, R. W. Robbins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 654–678). New York: The Guilford Press.

Seligman, M., & Adler, A. (2019). Positive education. In J. F. Helliwell, R. Layard, & J. Sachs (Eds.), *Global Happiness and Wellbeing Policy Report: 2019* (pp. 52 - 71). Global Council for Wellbeing and Happiness.

Seligman, M. E. P., Ernst, R. M., Gillham, J., Reivich, K., & Linkins, M. (2009). Positive education: Positive psychology and classroom interventions. *Oxford Review of Education, 35*(3), 293–311. https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980902934563

Ulas, J., & Aksu, M. (2015). Development of teacher autonomy scale for Turkish teachers. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 186*, 344–349. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.023

Yazıcı, A. Ş. (2016). The relationship between the teacher autonomy and learner autonomy support behaviors. *Journal of Educational Sciences Research, 6*(2), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.12973/jesr.2016.62.1

Yurdakul, B. (2020). *Yapılandırmacılık. Eğitimde Yeni Yönelimler*, 41–68. https://doi.org/10.14527/9786257052481.02