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In this study, the attitudes of teacher candidates towards the classroom as a learning environment was aimed to be examined. In order to determine the attitudes of teacher candidates towards the classroom as a learning environment, survey methods were used. The participants of this research consisted of freshmen and final year students at the education faculty of a state university. The convenience sampling method was used while selecting the participants in the study. Accordingly, data were collected from 348 prospective teachers. The data of the research was obtained via the “Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment”. The data was analyzed with non-parametric tests. As a result of the research, it was determined that prospective teachers’ attitude scores towards the classroom as a learning environment were at a moderate level. Attitudes of female prospective teachers towards the classroom as a learning environment are more positive than those of males. Women find class less boring. The students of the fine arts education department see the classroom as indispensable in terms of the learning environment, in contrast to the students of the mathematics and science education department and the special education department. Students with a medium level perception of academic success have more negative attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment than those with a good perception of academic success. Prospective teachers who are not satisfied with their department consider the classroom an indispensable learning environment compared to those who are partially satisfied. In light of the findings, it was suggested that classroom environments in education faculties should be improved in terms of classroom learning environment dimensions to help prospective teachers to develop positive attitudes.
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INTRODUCTION

Learning is a versatile and natural process that starts with the birth of the individual and continues throughout his/her life. Many factors affect learning. Among these factors, learning environments have an important place. From a general point of view, every environment where learning takes place can be defined as a learning environment. This environment can sometimes be the close environment of the individual, a school, and sometimes even a virtual environment. In this sense, the learning environment is a variable that affects the feelings and thoughts of the individual, his/her willingness level positively or negatively, and provides suitable learning opportunities for the individual’s development level (Dönmez, 2008).

In the literature, there are various definitions of different thinkers regarding the features that should be found in learning environments. The common point in the definitions is that learning environments should be in the form of comfortable physical environments where students feel comfortable, find peace, are free, experience the feeling of encouragement, and encourage thinking. It is a common thought that such environments will contribute to permanent learning, social learning, and make learning more enjoyable (Kline, 2002; Yıldırım, 2020).
Although the definition and perspective of the learning environment have been changing rapidly in our age when the ways of accessing information are differentiated, enriched, and in this sense has been easy, classrooms are usually the first to come to mind when a formal learning environment is mentioned. Most of the educational activities carried out to create behavior are carried out through schools, which are private circles established for educational purposes, and thus classrooms (Bursalıoğlu 1991: 33). The classroom is a place where students’ academic understanding and social relations develop, and in this sense, multi-faceted learning takes place. The classroom environment is one of the most important factors affecting not only learning but also students’ attitudes, personalities, motivations, and speed of learning (Açıkgoz, 1989).

The learning environment and the individuals in that environment are in direct relationship with each other and it is not possible to evaluate them separately. The classroom environment embodies the physical environment, psychological environment, and various teaching components. The quality of the classroom environment affects students’ self-image, confidence, learning, and attitudes towards the subjects (Daemi, M. N., Tahriri, A. & Zafarghandi, A. M. 2017).

The results of studies conducted on the subject revealed that the quality of the classroom environment in schools is an important determinant of student learning (Fraser, 1994). Perception of the classroom environment is a general feeling shared by everyone in the classroom (Dorman, Aldridge, & Fraser, 2006). Studies have shown that the learning environment is a determining factor in what students feel (Jones & Jones, 1995). Students’ attitudes towards the classroom environment affect their participation, self-efficacy, learning motivation, and academic achievement (Fauth, Decristan, Rieser, Klieme & Büttner, 2014; Friedel, Cortina, Turner & Midgley, 2010; Wang & Holcombe, 2010). On the other hand, many studies have shown that there is a strong relationship between student achievements (especially affective achievements) and students’ attitudes and thoughts about the classroom environment (Köse & Küçükoğlu, 2009).

Attitude is “a relatively persistent organization of beliefs, emotions, and behavioral dispositions toward socially significant objects, groups, events, or symbols.” (Hogg & Vaughan, 2005). Emotions can be defined as affective reactions (Russell & Barrett, 1999). Emotions can be formed as positive and negative. The distinction between positive and negative emotions is that: the often experienced positive emotions create; pleasure, pride, hope, and relief; whereas negative ones develop anger, anxiety, boredom, hopelessness, and shame (Pekrun, Goetz, Titz & Perry, 2002). Positive emotions act as a protective factor against stress and intrusive thoughts arising from negative experiences such as failure (Erez & Isen, 2002). The formation of positive feelings about the learning environment will create and maintain positive motivation.

Without any positive attitudes and perceptions, students have no chance to learn competently at all. There are two categories of attitudes and perceptions that affect learning: (1) attitudes and perceptions about the learning climate, and (2) attitudes and perceptions about classroom tasks. It is the duty of effective teachers to constantly strengthen attitudes and perceptions in both categories (Marzano, 1992).

Positive, productive learning environments are key to students’ academic, emotional and social success at school. Unfortunately, positive learning environments do not just happen by themselves, they need to be created and formed. There are many components for creating a positive learning environment for students. Positive learning environments should provide a safe environment where risk-taking is encouraged, open authentic conversations are present, trust and respect are encouraged, and positive interaction is the norm (Becton, 2021).

Examining students’ attitudes towards the classroom environment will reveal their effects as well as provide important data for teachers as feedback on the classroom environment (Fraser, 1998a; Rivard, 1994). In this context, it was aimed to examine the attitudes of prospective teachers towards the classroom as a learning environment. In accordance with this aim, answers to the following questions were sought;

Q1. What is the level of prospective teachers’ attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment?
Q2. Do the attitudes of prospective teachers towards the classroom as a learning environment show a significant difference according to gender, grade level, department, perception of academic success, and perception of the department?

METHOD

In this study, a survey method from descriptive research methods was used to determine the attitudes of prospective teachers towards the classroom as a learning environment. Descriptive research is concerned
with what something is rather than how or why, and the purpose of this research is to describe a phenomenon and its properties. In this respect; observation forms, attitude scales, standardized tests, and survey tools are generally used to collect data (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2003). In the survey method, which is frequently used in the field of education, data is collected from a large number of people in order to reveal certain characteristics of a group (Fraenkel, Wallen & Hyu, 2012).

**The Study Group**

Participants of this research consisted of 1st grade (freshman) and 4th grade students (Final Year) studying at the education faculty of a state university. The convenience sampling method was used while selecting the participants in the study. The convenience sampling method is a method in which easy to reach sample group due to limitations such as time is selected (Büyüköztürk et al., 2012). In the convenient sampling method, the researcher collects data starting from the people who can be reached, until reaching the desired number (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007).

Research data were collected face to face in the 2021-2022 semester. Non-volunteer students were not given a questionnaire. In this respect, data was obtained from 348 prospective teachers. As were not filled out properly 45 questionnaires were not included in the study. Data obtained from 303 prospective teachers were used in the study. The demographic qualities of the prospective teachers are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1: Demographic Qualities of the Prospective Teachers**

| Variable                     | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Gender                       |           |            |
| Female                       | 214       | 70.6       |
| Male                         | 89        | 29.4       |
| Grade                        |           |            |
| First Grade (Freshman)       | 176       | 58.1       |
| Fourth Grade (Final Year)    | 127       | 41.9       |
| Department                   |           |            |
| Department of Mathematics and Science Education | 46 | 15.2 |
| Department of Turkish and Social Sciences | 41 | 13.5 |
| Department of Basic Education | 40 | 13.2 |
| Department of Foreign Languages | 33 | 10.9 |
| Education                    |           |            |
| Department of Fine Arts Education | 30 | 9.9 |
| Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Department | 44 | 14.5 |
| Department of Special Education | 69 | 22.8 |
| Academic Success Perception  |           |            |
| Very good                    | 92        | 30.4       |
| Good                         | 139       | 45.9       |
| Medium                       | 72        | 23.8       |
| Department Satisfaction      |           |            |
| I am satisfied               | 219       | 72.3       |
| I am partially satisfied     | 46        | 15.2       |
| I am not satisfied           | 38        | 12.5       |

According to Table 1, the ratio of female students is 70.6% whereas the male students are 29.4%. It could be stated that a great majority of the prospective teachers are female. According to the grade level, the ratio of 4th grade students is 47% whereas first grade students are 58.1%. When the distribution of the students according to their departments is examined, it is seen that the special education department has the highest participation with 22.8%. 30.4% of the students perceive their academic success as very good, 45.9% as good, and 23.8% as a medium. The majority of the students (72.3%) stated that they were satisfied with their departments.

**Data Collection Tools**

In this study, five points Likert scale “Attitude Scale Towards Classroom as a Learning Environment” developed by Çetin, Demirkan, and Çetin (2020) with the students of the faculty of education in the age range of 15-25, was used (“Totally Agree”, “Substantially Agree”, “Partially Agree”, “Disagree”, “Totally Disagree”).

Researchers obtained a scale consisting of 32 items and 4 sub-dimensions as a result of Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA). The scale consisted of these sub-factors respectively: “Classroom as a boring learning
environment”, “Classroom as a positive learning environment”, “Classroom as a peaceful learning environment”, and “Classroom as necessary learning environment”. It is observed that this four-factor structure making up the scale explained 62.49% of the total variance of the scale. According to the results of the reliability analysis of the scale, Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the overall scale was determined as .96, and for the other sub-factors in the scale as .95, .90, .88, and .84, respectively. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis performed after the exploratory factor analysis, the fit values of the model; were found as RMSEA, .066; χ2/df=2.1; SRMR=.05; IFI=.91; CFI=.91.

Within the scope of this research, in the data obtained from the prospective teachers, the Cronbach alpha coefficient of the overall scale was found as .956; with the scale sub-dimensions respectively as .94, .89, .87, and .78. As a result, taken into consideration the criterion that reliability coefficient of .70 and above is considered reliable it can be said that the reliability coefficients are sufficient (Field, 2009; Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Data Analysis

The data of the research was analyzed via SPSS 22 program. Attitude levels of prospective teachers were defined by mean, frequency, and standard deviation descriptive statistics. According to the Kolmogorov Smirnov test results obtained from the general and sub-dimensions of the attitude scale towards the classroom as a learning environment according to gender, class, department, perception of academic achievement, and perception of department satisfaction variables the data do not show normal distribution. The Kolmogorov Smirnov test results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test Results of the Overall Scale and Sub-Dimensions

| Scales                               | Statistic | sd  | p    |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-----|------|
| Classroom as a boring learning environment | ,088      | 303 | ,000 |
| Classroom as a positive learning environment | ,071      | 303 | ,001 |
| Classroom as a peaceful learning environment | ,118      | 303 | ,000 |
| Classroom as a necessary learning environment | ,105      | 303 | ,000 |
| Overall Scale                        | ,079      | 303 | ,000 |

According to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results in Table 2, it was determined that the distribution did not show a normal distribution as it was p<.05 (Büyüköztürk, 2013). The Kolmogorov Smirnov test tends to reject the assumption of normal distribution of the data when the sample grows (Pallant, 2016) and this situation may lead to type 1 error (Uysal & Kılıç, 2022). Therefore, each sub-factor and the overall scale were also examined according to the skewness coefficient/standard error rate according to the independent variable groups (Uysal & Kılıç, 2022). This ratio was evaluated according to whether it was between +1.96 and -1.96 (Field, 2009). The obtained values revealed that the data did not show normal distribution. For this reason, non-parametric tests were used in the analysis. Confidence Interval was determined as 95% and the significance as p=.05. In the descriptive statistics, the comments were made according to the five-interval categories. After the Kruskal Wallis H test, in order to determine which groups caused the significant differences were determined by pairwise comparisons using the Dunn-Bonferroni approach in the SPSS program.

FINDINGS

In this part of the study, the findings are presented relatively within the framework of sub-problems. The findings of the descriptive statistics of the scores obtained from the general and sub-dimensions of the prospective teachers’ attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment are given in Table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Prospective Teachers’ Scores on the ”Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment”

| Scale Sub-Dimensions and Overall Scale | n  | X   | s   | Comments               |
|---------------------------------------|----|-----|-----|------------------------|
| Classroom as a boring learning environment | 303 | 3.42 | .91 | I largely agree        |
| Classroom as a positive learning environment | 303 | 3.31 | .72 | I moderately agree     |
| Classroom as a peaceful learning environment | 303 | 2.54 | .84 | I disagree             |
| Classroom as a necessary learning environment | 303 | 2.83 | .85 | I moderately agree     |
| Overall scale                          | 303 | 3.18 | .72 | I moderately agree     |

In Table 3, it is seen that prospective teachers stated that they substantially agreed with the dimension of ”Classroom as a boring learning environment” when the average scores of the prospective teachers’
attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment were examined based on factors. Since all of the items in this dimension are negative (items are reversed), prospective teachers do not find the classroom to be a boring learning environment. Prospective teachers' attitudes towards "class as a positive learning environment" and "classroom as a necessary learning environment" are at a moderate level. The attitudes of the students towards the "classroom as a peaceful learning environment" are at the level of disagreeing, that is, negative. In general, their attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment are at a moderate level.

A) According to gender variable;

Table 4. Mann-Whitney U-Test Results of Prospective Teachers' "Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment" Scores by Gender

|                                      | N  | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks | U          | p       |
|--------------------------------------|----|-----------|--------------|------------|---------|
| Classroom as a boring learning       |    |           |              |            |         |
| environment                          | Female | 214 | 165,54      | 35424,50   | 6626,500 | <.000   |
|                                      | Male   | 89  | 119,46      | 10631,50   |          |         |
| Classroom as a positive learning     |    |           |              |            |         |
| environment                          | Female | 214 | 156,62      | 33516,50   | 8534,500 | <.154   |
|                                      | Male   | 89  | 140,89      | 12539,50   |          |         |
| Classroom as a peaceful learning     |    |           |              |            |         |
| environment                          | Female | 214 | 157,23      | 33647,00   | 8404,000 | <.106   |
|                                      | Male   | 89  | 139,43      | 12409,00   |          |         |
| Classroom as a necessary learning    |    |           |              |            |         |
| environment                          | Female | 214 | 149,64      | 32022,00   | 9017,000 | <.464   |
|                                      | Male   | 89  | 157,69      | 14034,00   |          |         |
| Overall Scale                        |    |           |              |            |         |
|                                      | Female | 214 | 162,39      | 34752,50   | 7298,500 | <.001   |
|                                      | Male   | 89  | 127,01      | 11303,50   |          |         |

When Table 4 is examined, according to the Mann Whitney-U test results, according to the gender of the prospective teachers, in the sub-factor of the classroom as a boring learning environment (U=6626,500, p<.000) and the overall scale (U=7298,500, p<.001) there is a meaningful difference while there is no significant difference in other dimensions. It can be said that female students find the classroom less boring than male students. Female students' attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment are more positive than males.

B) According to grade variable;

Table 5. Mann Whitney U-Test Results of Prospective Teachers' "Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment" Scores by Grade

|                                      | N   | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks | U          | p   |
|--------------------------------------|-----|-----------|--------------|------------|-----|
| Classroom as a boring learning       |     |           |              |            |     |
| environment                          | First Grade (Freshman) | 176 | 158,34      | 27867,50   | 10060,500 | .138 |
|                                      | Fourth Grade (Final Year) | 127 | 143,22      | 18188,50   |       |     |
| Classroom as a positive learning     |     |           |              |            |     |
| environment                          | First Grade (Freshman) | 176 | 154,05      | 27113,50   | 10814,500 | .630 |
|                                      | Fourth Grade (Final Year) | 127 | 149,15      | 18942,50   |       |     |
| Classroom as a peaceful learning     |     |           |              |            |     |
| environment                          | First Grade (Freshman) | 176 | 152,05      | 26761,50   | 11166,500 | .990 |
|                                      | Fourth Grade (Final Year) | 127 | 151,93      | 19294,50   |       |     |
| Classroom as a necessary learning    |     |           |              |            |     |
| environment                          | First Grade (Freshman) | 176 | 152,31      | 26806,00   | 11122,000 | .942 |
|                                      | Fourth Grade (Final Year) | 127 | 151,57      | 19250,00   |       |     |
| Overall Scale                        |     |           |              |            |     |
|                                      | First Grade (Freshman) | 176 | 156,43      | 27531,00   | 10397,000 | .300 |
|                                      | Fourth Grade (Final Year) | 127 | 145,87      | 18525,00   |       |     |

When Table 5 is examined, according to the results of the Mann Whitney-U test, no significant difference was observed in the scale sub-dimensions and overall scale according to the grade level of the prospective teachers. There is no significant difference between the scores of the first (freshman) and fourth grade (final grade) students' attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment.
C) According to the department variable,

Table 6. Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Prospective Teachers' "Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment" Scores According to Department Variable

| N       | Mean rank | X^2  | sd | p    | Intergroup difference |
|---------|-----------|------|----|------|-----------------------|
|         | Classroom as a boring learning environment |         |    |      |                       |
|         | 1. Department of Mathematics and Science Education | 46     | 153.48 |      |                       |
|         | 2. Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Department | 41     | 179.24 |      |                       |
|         | 3. Department of Basic Education | 40     | 152.98 | 5.586 | 6      | .471                  |
|         | 4. Department of Foreign Languages Education | 33     | 142.24 |      |                       |
|         | 5. Department of Fine Arts Education | 30     | 141.23 |      |                       |
|         | 6. Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Department | 44     | 140.80 |      |                       |
|         | 7. Department of Special Education | 69     | 150.75 |      |                       |
|         | Classroom as a positive learning environment |         |    |      |                       |
|         | 1. Department of Mathematics and Science Education | 46     | 145.68 |      |                       |
|         | 2. Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Department | 41     | 149.40 |      |                       |
|         | 3. Department of Basic Education | 40     | 144.75 | 11.926 | 6 | .064                  |
|         | 4. Department of Foreign Languages Education | 33     | 139.56 |      |                       |
|         | 5. Department of Fine Arts Education | 30     | 198.00 |      |                       |
|         | 6. Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Department | 44     | 165.22 |      |                       |
|         | 7. Department of Special Education | 69     | 139.48 |      |                       |
|         | Classroom as a peaceful learning environment |         |    |      |                       |
|         | 1. Department of Mathematics and Science Education | 46     | 143.43 |      |                       |
|         | 2. Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Department | 41     | 159.79 |      |                       |
|         | 3. Department of Basic Education | 40     | 144.84 | 8,416 | 6 | .209                  |
|         | 4. Department of Foreign Languages Education | 33     | 131.06 |      |                       |
|         | 5. Department of Fine Arts Education | 30     | 174.07 |      |                       |
|         | 6. Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Department | 44     | 174.36 |      |                       |
|         | 7. Department of Special Education | 69     | 143.39 |      |                       |
|         | Classroom as a necessary learning environment |         |    |      |                       |
|         | 1. Department of Mathematics and Science Education | 46     | 136.57 |      |                       |
|         | 2. Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Department | 41     | 135.82 |      |                       |
|         | 3. Department of Basic Education | 40     | 146.09 | 17.023 | 6 | .009                  |
|         | 4. Department of Foreign Languages Education | 33     | 168.42 |      |                       |
|         | 5. Department of Fine Arts Education | 30     | 203.07 |      |                       |
|         | 6. Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Department | 44     | 163.25 |      |                       |
|         | 7. Department of Special Education | 69     | 138.10 |      |                       |
|         | Overall Scale | 5 |     |      |                       |
|         | 5. Department of Fine Arts Education | 30     | 169.83 |      |                       |
|         | 6. Department of Computer and Instructional Technologies Department | 44     | 153.27 |      |                       |
|         | 7. Department of Special Education | 69     | 146.09 |      |                       |

When Table 6 is examined, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of "classroom as a necessary learning environment" according to the department variable of the prospective teachers ($X^2=14.763$, $p=.009$). After the Kruskal Wallis H test, in order to determine which groups caused the significant differences, pairwise comparisons using the Dunn-Bonferroni approach in the SPSS program was used. Fine Arts Education Department students have higher attitude scores towards the classroom as a necessary learning environment compared to mathematics and science education and special education department students. That is to say, the students of the fine arts education department see the classroom as a necessary learning environment compared to the students of the mathematics and science education department and the special education department.

D) According to academic achievement perception,
Table 7. Kruskal Wallis Test Results of Prospective Teachers' "Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment" Scores According to Academic Achievement Perception Variable

| Classroom as a boring learning environment | N  | Mean Rank | X²  | sd  | p   | Intergroup Difference |
|-------------------------------------------|----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------|
| 1. Very good                              | 92 | 168,52    | 12,217 | 2   | .002 | 3-1                   |
| 2. Good                                   | 139| 156,69    |       |     |     | 3-2                   |
| 3. Medium                                 | 72 | 121,84    |       |     |     |                       |
| Classroom as a positive learning environment |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. Very good                              | 92 | 153,74    | 2,115 | 2   | .347 |                       |
| 2. Good                                   | 139| 157,47    |       |     |     |                       |
| 3. Medium                                 | 72 | 139,22    |       |     |     |                       |
| Classroom as a peaceful learning environment |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. Very good                              | 92 | 159,15    | 5,979 | 2   | .05  | -                     |
| 2. Good                                   | 139| 158,64    |       |     |     |                       |
| 3. Medium                                 | 72 | 130,04    |       |     |     |                       |
| Classroom as a necessary learning environment |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. Very good                              | 92 | 151,04    | 2,207 | 2   | .332 |                       |
| 2. Good                                   | 139| 146,03    |       |     |     |                       |
| 3. Medium                                 | 72 | 164,75    |       |     |     |                       |
| Overall scale                             |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. Very good                              | 92 | 163,53    | 7,594 | 2   | .022 | 3-2                   |
| 2. Good                                   | 139| 156,97    |       |     |     |                       |
| 3. Medium                                 | 72 | 127,67    |       |     |     |                       |

When Table 7 is examined, a significant difference was found in the sub-dimension of "Classroom as a boring learning environment" (X²=12.217, p=.002) and the overall scale (X²=12.217, p=.002) according to the variable of perception of academic achievement of teacher candidates when Table 7 is examined. After the Kruskal Wallis H test, the groups that caused the significant differences were determined by pairwise comparisons using the Dunn-Bonferroni approach in the SPSS program. Students who perceive their academic success as a medium see the classroom as a more boring learning environment than students who perceive their academic success as good or very good. Students with a medium perception of academic success have more negative attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment than those with a good perception of academic success.

E) According to department satisfaction perception

Table 8. Kruskal-Wallis Test Results of Prospective Teachers' "Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment" Scores According to Achievement Perception Variable

| Classroom as a boring learning environment | N  | Mean Rank | X²  | sd  | p   | Intergroup Difference |
|-------------------------------------------|----|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------|
| 1. I am satisfied                         | 219| 174,96    | 57,459 | 2   | .000 | 1-3                   |
| 2. I am partially satisfied              | 46 | 107,46    |       |     |     | 1-2                   |
| 3. I am not satisfied                    | 38 | 73,58     |       |     |     |                       |
| Classroom as a positive learning environment |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. I am satisfied                         | 219| 168,89    | 29,773 | 2   | .000 | 1-3                   |
| 2. I am partially satisfied              | 46 | 102,99    |       |     |     | 1-2                   |
| 3. I am not satisfied                    | 38 | 113,97    |       |     |     |                       |
| Classroom as a peaceful learning environment |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. I am satisfied                         | 219| 169,88    | 36,126 | 2   | .000 | 1-3                   |
| 2. I am partially satisfied              | 46 | 120,33    |       |     |     | 1-2                   |
| 3. I am not satisfied                    | 38 | 87,30     |       |     |     |                       |
| Classroom as a necessary learning environment |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. I am satisfied                         | 219| 155,08    | 6,467  | 2   | .039 | 2-3                   |
| 2. I am partially satisfied              | 46 | 123,75    |       |     |     | 2-3                   |
| 3. I am not satisfied                    | 38 | 168,43    |       |     |     |                       |
| Scale overall                             |    |           |       |     |     |                       |
| 1. I am satisfied                         | 219| 174,35    | 52,856 | 2   | .000 | 1-3                   |
| 2. I am partially satisfied              | 46 | 104,08    |       |     |     | 1-2                   |
| 3. I am not satisfied                    | 38 | 81,20     |       |     |     |                       |
When Table 8 is examined, a meaningful difference was found in all sub-dimensions and overall scale according to the perception of satisfaction variable with the department of prospective teachers. As a result of pairwise comparisons using the Dunn-Bonferroni approach there was a meaningful difference in favor of those who were satisfied with their department in the sub-dimensions “Classroom as a boring learning environment” ($X^2=57,459, p=.000$), “Classroom as a positive learning environment” ($X^2=29,773, p=.000$), “Classroom as a peaceful environment” ($X^2=36,126, p=.000$) and the overall scale ($X^2=52,856, p=.000$). In the sub-dimension of "classroom as a necessary learning environment", a meaningful difference was found in favor of those who were not satisfied with the department ($X^2=6.467, p=.000$). In other words, students who are satisfied with their department do not find the classroom boring compared to other students and see the classroom as a peaceful and positive learning environment. In general, the attitudes of the students who are satisfied with the department towards the classroom as a learning environment are more positive than the other students. Students who are not satisfied with their department consider the classroom as a necessary learning environment compared to those who are partially satisfied.

**DISCUSSION AND RESULT**

The attitudes of students towards the classroom as a learning environment who spend about 20,000 hours in the classroom environment from primary education to higher education and are expected to perform many learnings are of great importance (Fraser, 2001). Such that, students studying in the same class may even have different perceptions of the learning environment (Fraser, Rennie & Tobin, 1990). This situation led to the development of various measurement tools (Fraser, 1998) in order to evaluate students’ perceptions towards the classroom as a learning environment. This study, it was aimed to determine the attitudes of prospective teachers towards the classroom as a learning environment who are expected to create a positive learning environment for their students as future teachers. For this purpose, in this study, the “Attitude Scale towards Classroom as a Learning Environment” developed by Çetin, Demirkan & Çetin (2020) was used.

According to the findings of the research, prospective teachers' attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment, in general, are at the level of "I agree at a moderate level", while their attitudes towards the classroom as a peaceful environment are at the level of "I disagree". Fraser (1994) states that learner outcomes are strongly influenced by the learning environment. Therefore, this finding gives the idea that the classroom environment in which prospective teachers study should be improved in terms of an effective learning environment.

In many studies about the classroom environment, it has been determined that there are differences between male and female students (Lim, 1995; Riah & Fraser, 1999; Rickards, Fisher & Fraser, 1997). Similarly, in this study, significant differences emerged between female and male prospective teachers. Attitudes of female prospective teachers towards the classroom as a learning environment are more positive than those of males. Women find class less boring. Waxman and Huang (1998) found out that women's perceptions of the learning environment were generally higher than male students as the result of the study in which they examined students' perceptions of the classroom learning environment.

There is no meaningful difference between the scores of the freshman and final grade students' attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment. It can be thought that the university and internship experiences of prospective teachers will not be effective on their attitudes. Contrary to the findings of this research, Khalil and Saar (2009) found significant differences according to grade level and age, as a result of their research in which they determined student perceptions of the classroom learning environment.

Fine Arts Education Department students have higher attitude scores towards the classroom as a necessary learning environment compared to mathematics and science education and special education department students. The students of the fine arts education department see the classroom as a necessary learning environment in contrast to the students of the mathematics and science education and special education department. This may be due to the fact that the classroom environment of the students of the fine arts department has a more positive classroom atmosphere than in other fields or that they need the classroom more in terms of their own work.

Classrooms are accepted as an important environment for students in order to achieve success (Baek & Choi, 2002). In this study, students with a moderate perception of academic success have more negative attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment than those with a good perception of academic
success. Similarly, students who perceive their academic success as moderate see the classroom as a more boring learning environment than students who perceive their academic success as good or very good. In the related literature, there are studies revealing a positive relationship between the perception of the classroom learning environment and academic achievement (Baek & Choi, 2002), and academic self-efficacy (Dorman & Adams, 2004). Gouri, Mitashree, and Meeta (2005) showed in their study that the classroom environment plays an important role in determining the academic achievement of the student. Similarly, Köse and Küçükoğlu (2009) determined that the classroom learning environment affects student achievement, according to the views of the education faculty students.

Students who are satisfied with their department do not find the classroom boring compared to other students and see the classroom as a peaceful and positive learning environment. Generally, the attitudes of the students who are satisfied with the department towards the classroom as a learning environment are more positive than the other students. Students who are not satisfied with their department consider the classroom as a necessary learning environment compared to those who are partially satisfied.

The realization of educational activities requires great effort and cost. For this reason, the actions to be taken should be planned and take into account the research findings (Toraman & Demir, 2016). Based on the results obtained in this research, it could be recommended that classroom environments in education faculties be improved to help students develop positive attitudes, such as increasing student participation, rearranging physical conditions, student-instructor relationships, etc. The classroom learning environment of fine arts education departments can be analyzed and compared with the classroom learning environment of other departments as they were found to lead to more positive attitudes towards the classroom as a learning environment. Adjustments to be made by determining the expectations of students with low academic success and dissatisfaction with their department from the classroom learning environment can contribute to the increase of students’ academic success and satisfaction with the department, as well as to develop attitudes towards the classroom as a positive learning environment.
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