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Abstract
The study examined Gutmann’s (1987) theoretical framework of democratic education in an empirical context of some private middle schools in Lebanon. The research examined the relationship of teachers’ Transformational leadership (TL) behavior and process-based curriculum with democratic classroom climate, as democratic means, and student’s participatory citizenship, as democratic ends, for middle school students in Lebanon. The sample consisted of 12 teachers and 301 students from grades 6, 7, and 8 in 4 schools. Instruments used were Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (5x), Democratic Classroom Climate, and Participatory Citizenship. The results indicated no significant correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and Democratic Classroom Climate. There was no significant correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and middle school students’ participatory citizenship. On the other hand, process-based curriculum schools scored significantly higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on democratic classroom climate. Moreover, process-based curriculum schools scored higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on students’ participatory citizenship with marginal significance.
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Gutmann (1987) claims that if we are committed to democracy, then we are to promote democratic education. This study is based on Amy Gutmann’s (1987) definition of democratic education as one that is democratic in both its means and ends. This definition indicates the possibility of a comprehensive democratic educational experience through democratic means and democratic ends of education. The general purpose of this study was to examine a theoretical understanding of democratic education in an empirical context through the examination of characteristics of middle schools operating in Lebanon. Gutmann (1987) affirms that empirical research is required to evaluate the appeal of democratic education; its means and ends.
1 Theoretical Background of the Study and Literature Review

Gutmann (1987) calls for a theory of education that is first and foremost democratic. According to her, what is required for education is a democratic theory rather than a random one. This democratic theory of education is utilized here through founding the current study on Gutmann’s theoretical framework.

1.1 Gutmann’s Theoretical Framework (1987)

This framework emphasizes the need for education that is democratic only if the means and ends are democratic. Gutmann (1987) believes that the means of democratic education comprises balancing parental, professional, and public authority figures. On the other hand, Gutmann argues that the creation of democratic citizens capable of governing their lives and contributing to society’s governance is the aim of democratic education. To top it off, Gutmann presents conscious social reproduction as the ideal of democratic education. This ideal empowers citizens to affect education which makes possible the reconstruction of political principles, perspectives, and means. Generally, deliberate teaching and the influence of educational systems are two essences at the core of democratic educational theory (Gutmann, 1987). Gutmann (1987) suggests two conditions for conscious social reproduction ideal to be possible; a non-repressive and a non-discriminatory society. The condition of “non-repression” hinders attempts to use education to limit deliberation of different understandings of good life. Gutmann further argues for “critical deliberation” which refuses any blind compliance to a single political system or way of good life in a democratic society. Gutmann’s (1987) second condition for conscious social reproduction, “non-discrimination”, assures that discrimination against any group of children is not permitted.

2 Gutmann’s Democratic Means and Ends in an Empirical Context

2.1 Democratic Classroom Climate as Means of Democratic Education

Gutmann (1987) argues that through democratic education, learners collectively participate in decision-making, problem-solving, and dialogue which allow for conscious involvement. The author of this study suggests “democratic classroom climate” as a democratic means that converges with Gutmann’s framework. Torney-Purta (2002) affirms that classroom climate that hosts courteous dialogue over controversial political and civic topics is coupled with adolescents’ civic engagement. Likewise, Range, Carnes-Holt, and Bruce (2013) stress the need for an engaging and caring climate that hosts democratic practices in a middle school classroom since the emotional and educational needs of middle school students are special.

This democratic classroom climate embraces deliberation, dialogue, questioning, and problem-solving as some democratic practices. Deliberation is a comprehensive democratic approach (Gutmann, 1987; Gutmann & Thompson, 2002). In particular, deliberation is useful for middle school students. According to Shu-Hua (2012), deliberation could be a learning strategy used with middle school students to foster their democratic behavior. In addition, dialogue is a fundamental classroom learning dynamic that respects the voices of students (Greene, 1993; Freire, 1996; Gutmann, 1987; Lim, 2011; Print, Ørsmstrom, &Skovgaard Nielsen, 2002; Schneider, 2010; Tammi, 2013; Tannebaum, 2013; Torney-Purta, 2002; Wilhelm& Wilhelm, 2010). Moreover, questioning renders a classroom climate democratic (Brough, 2012; Matsumura, Slater, & Crosson, 2008; Print et al., 2002; Schneider, 2010). Problem-solving is yet another democratic classroom environment mode (Brough, 2012; Dewey, 1964; Freire, 1996; Gutmann, 1987; Hytten, 2009; Lim, 2011).

A study of 403 Italian adolescents between 11 and 15 years conducted by Lenzi, Vieno, Sharkey, Mayworm, Scacchi, Pastore, and Santinello (2014) underscores schools’ educational
climate for teenagers’ democratic education. Lenzi et al. (2014) conclude that in a democratic school environment, learners examine their societal role and society functions. When adolescent students are involved in decision-making in areas affecting their lives, they consider their teacher fair. Such a climate fortifies teenagers’ moral development, values of justice, democratic values, and preparation for social action in communities (Lenzi et al. 2014). Moreover, Lenzi et al. (2014) affirm that justice in the school and civic dialogues are the mediators between democratic school climate and civic engagement of adolescents. Lenzi et al (2014) also propose classroom techniques that increase engagement such as cooperative learning and increased student engagement in policy-making and decision-taking.

To top it off, Morrison (2008) suggests that the micro level of democratic education could be sensed inside the classroom. According to Print et al., (2002), to create a democratic atmosphere at school, a democratic classroom needs to be ensured. The classroom environment has to be one of confidence and safety to indulge in democratic experiences. Morrison (2008) further asserts that for the school to be democratic, it is essential that the classroom becomes a medium where students are entitled to independence, free will, and rights to select academic material, timing, and place. Kesici (2008) also argues that in a democratic classroom, teachers ensure just treatment among pupils, learners’ autonomy, and equal opportunities.

2.2 Participatory Citizenship as End of Democratic Education

Gutmann (1987) argues that democratic education prepares students to consciously reproduce rather than replicate their society. Gutmann recommends empirical research to evaluate the effectiveness of democratic schooling on the development of participatory qualities in students such as dedication to community, political efficacy and participation, and respect to diversity. Hence, the author of this study put forward “participatory citizenship” as the end of democratic education for middle school students. According to Westheimer and Kahne (2004), there are three useful versions of good citizenship which reflect different viewpoints: personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented citizens.

Westheimer and Kahne (2004) argue that character education programs based on personal responsibility are insufficient to create democratic citizens. Participatory citizenship makes a democratic end of education. To elaborate, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) define the participatory citizen as a leader and an active member of society characterized by participation in civic matters and social life of community. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) assert that a participatory citizenship program helped enhance students’ leadership effectiveness. Students also felt empowered that their projects could make an effect on their community; civic efficacy.

3 Characteristics related to Democratic Means and Ends

Lenzi et al. (2014) recommend more research in which school climate characteristics enhance civic responsibility. Consequently, the current study presented Teacher’s Transformational Leadership (TL) and process-based curriculum as school characteristics that might enhance democratic means and ends of education along with civic responsibility.

3.1 Teacher’s Transformational Leadership Behavior

In the preface to the second edition of Transformational Leadership, Bass and Riggio (2006) explain the mounting appeal of transformational leadership (TL) and the expanding research on it. Today’s work conditions require a leadership model that goes beyond directing followers through times of instability. Transactional Leadership is characterized by exchanges between leaders, equals, and followers where the leader communicates the requirements and the subsequent rewards.
TL is rather a leadership that leads followers towards elevated functioning and trustworthiness through empowering and challenging them. It is a model characterized by followers’ intrinsic incentives and positive growth. Unlike transactional leadership, TL surpasses practices of exchange. Moreover, extensive literature verifies that TL is “more effective” than transactional leadership in terms of organizational culture, followers’ commitment, satisfaction, elevated performance, empowerment, and others (Bass& Riggio, 2006).

According to Bass and Riggio (2006), MacGregor Burns brought in TL more than a quarter of a century ago. Later, TL model and measurement tools were established by Bass and his colleagues. This model went through an evolution from viewing leadership as a passive form to successively viewing it as laissez-fair, transactional, and finally transformational (Bass& Riggio, 2006). TL utilizes one or more of its four components to attain greater followers’ outcomes rather than carrying out agreements. These components are Idealized Influence (II), Inspirational Motivation (IM), Intellectual Stimulation (IS), and Individualized Consideration (IC). Leaders of charismatic TL who exhibit Idealized Influence are regarded by followers as role models. Through Inspirational Motivation, leaders encourage, challenge, and convince followers. Intellectual Stimulation is possible through cultivating the thinking capabilities of followers. Care, scaffold, and sensitivity to the needs of followers are maintained through Individualized Consideration (Bass& Riggio, 2006).

In this study, teachers’ authentic TL was examined through the use of the scale Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ (5X)) by Bass and Avolio, 1995 which reflects all elements of TL and will be discussed in the methodology chapter in details. Bass and Riggio (2006) assert that authentic TL is ensured when leaders use TL components to encourage followers towards greater work performance and loyalty. TL could be spurious if leaders abuse TL components to control followers and ensure followers’ reliance on leaders.

### 3.1.1 TL and Teachers

TL could be used in an educational setting. According to Bass (1997), TL is a universal leadership model. Transactional and Transformational leadership styles could be evident in a big multitude of countries and institutions. Moreover, Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) reveal that TL components have a positive relationship with college student learning outcomes, student participation, and perceptions of teacher credibility. Thus, TL in a classroom setting could have more influence than it was previously believed to have. Treslan (2006) argues that nowadays effective teachers practice some TL practices in the classroom through their relationship with students. Treslan (2006) recommends TL as a novice classroom leadership due to benefits of its emphasis on participatory decision-making, deliberation, knowledge of self, morality, common vision, and empowerment. Likewise, Slavich and Zimbardo (2012) suggest transformational teaching as a comprehensive classroom teaching style. Similarly, Beauchamp, Barling, and Morton (2011) assert that training for TL of Physical Education teachers is viable.

The current study focused on the student as a receptor of TL. Bass and Riggio’s (2006) call for future research focusing on the followers because the focus so far has been on the leaders in this model. Therefore, this study suggested a new possible influence of TL and that is on democratic classroom climate and participatory citizenship of students.

### 3.1.2 TL for Democratic Means and Ends

First, through TL’s elements and influence, teacher’s TL behavior acts as an implied democratic factor that facilitates a democratic classroom climate. Rafferty and Griffin (2004) suggested five sub-dimensions of TL: vision, personal recognition, inspirational communication,
intellectual stimulation, and supportive leadership. Moreover, effects of TL also support the suggested influence of TL on democratic classroom climate. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), literature on TL assures an encouraging association with a positive organization’s culture. An organizational culture depicted as transformational is family-like because leaders and followers rely on each other. Bass and Riggio (2006) argue that the essence of this genuine culture is the sharing of interests, vision, goals, and shared norms and consequent behaviors (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Leaders themselves facilitate a democratic climate. Furthermore, Bass and Riggio (2006) consider transformational leaders as adaptive ones who best suit followers’ needs. They are leaders and role models who know when to be considerate to followers’ needs and when to stimulate their capabilities. In this culture, leaders and followers transcend incentives and personal needs for the welfare of the institution and promotion of quality.

Second, TL of teachers could make an implicit democratic practice that facilitates participatory citizenship. The researcher of the current study suggested TL as an implicit democratic practice by discussing notions of “empowerment” and “delegation” that are presented by Bass and Riggio (2006). Bass and Riggio (2006) recommend future research regarding the extent to which transformational leaders help in developing future transformational leaders. In comparison, students benefiting from teacher’s TL could be transformational leaders in the future. According to Bass and Riggio (2006), literature on empowerment has grown due to its favorable influence. To facilitate the autonomy of followers is to empower them. Through an empowerment framework, followers’ self-regulation is encouraged. Besides, followers are to match their interests with that of the institution and perform tasks by directing themselves. Bass and Riggio (2006) assert that the empowerment of followers through TL leadership makes the growth of followers possible; and it is this growth that makes the essence of TL.

Sharing responsibilities and TL elements such as individual consideration (IC) and intellectual stimulation (IS) create empowerment (Bass & Riggio, 2006). If the end of education is a participatory citizen capable of change in her community, then preparation for that empowerment is crucial. Bass and Riggio (2006) claim that empowered followers have transformational leaders. In congruence, participatory citizens are empowered by having a TL teacher. This empowerment is possible as TL teachers utilize delegation. According to Avolio and Bass (1991), as cited in Bass & Riggio (2006), delegation acts as an empowering practice where the follower has the responsibility and autonomy to complete a task. Sharing of power helps followers achieve beyond expectations as they indulge in group-decision making (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

3.2 Process-Based Curriculum

The term process-oriented curriculum was used in the current study to embrace curricular approaches that vary in names but focus on the learner, relevant content, and the process of learning. According to Marjanovic (2005), interdisciplinary and integrated learning activities such as problem-solving are at the core of process-oriented curriculum.

For instance, the process learning task that is widely used today is problem-based learning (Marjanovic, 2005). For a democratic learning experience, problems discussed should be relevant to learners. Similarly, Lim (2011) asserts that for critical thinking curricula to attain democracy, learners should be involved in authentic problem-solving, reasoning, and reflection based on democratic deliberation. Lim (2011) further explains that critical thinking rotates around learners analyzing, assessing, and forming arguments.

Moreover, inquiry also focuses on learning processes and learners themselves. According to Bell, Urhahne, Schanze, and Ploetzner (2010), a currently adopted educational practice is collaborative inquiry learning which centers on self-regulated education and teachers as scaffolds.
Bell et al. (2010) claim that inquiring problems makes use of prior experiences and enables transfer of knowledge and experience. Bell et al. (2010) argue that inquiry is a process encompassing generation of questions, investigation of data, student-initiated learning activities, and collaborative learning. Likewise, Wilhelm and Wilhelm (2010) argue for an inquiry-based classroom where learners generate good questions and create methods to find answers. Besides, documentation of learning is a learning process at the heart of inquiry. According to Falk and Darling-Hammond (2010), documentation allows for observing learner’s mode of learning and creating a curriculum that rotates around children’s previous understanding. Learners are involved in curriculum planning through setting future lines of inquiry.

3.2.1 Process-Based Curriculum for Democratic Means and Ends

A process-based curriculum was presented in the current study as the second variable that could have a relationship with democratic means and ends. Glassman and Patton’s study (2014) presents an understanding of a curriculum that surpasses a list of skills. Glassman and Patton (2014) call for a curriculum where Dewey and Freire’s perspectives could act as an approach to understand education in this century. Dewey and Freire highlight freedom of choice and the process by which individuals use their capabilities to enhance their position in the world (Glassman & Patton, 2014). This reflects the elements of democratic classroom environment that hosts freedom of choice along with Deweyan and Freirean education.

On the other hand, process-based curriculum that diverts from pre-set objectives and topics helps create participatory citizens. According to Glassman and Patton (2014), curriculum based on capabilities is not merely a set of skills. A useful curriculum utilizes capabilities to enhance students’ belief that they have a real choice in their life pathways. Skills taught are connected to real life dynamics and attained along with self-consciousness (Glassman & Patton, 2014). This curriculum, Glassman and Patton (2014) argue, prepares learners to assume more control in individual experience and society. It prepares students for social action and responsibility.

4 Hypotheses

H1: There is a positive correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and democratic classroom climate
H2: There is a positive correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and middle school students’ participatory citizenship
H3: Process-based curriculum schools score higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on democratic classroom climate
H4: Process-based curriculum schools score higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on students’ participatory citizenship

5 Significance of the Study

5.1 Professional Significance

The current study is of significance because it aimed to conduct an empirical research on a theoretical framework presented in Gutmann’s book *Democratic Education*. This study offered operational terms that converge with Gutmann’s (1987) democratic means and ends.

This study responded to the call for examining teacher’s leadership role and TL in a classroom setting. To start with, Khan and Malik (2013) deem that it is essential to investigate the teacher’s responsibility as leaders for pupil’s growth. According to Bolkan and Goodboy (2009), up till now only some literature tackled the topic of TL in the college context with teachers as the unit of study. To top it off, Beauchamp et al. (2011) research has investigated the effect of principal’s
TL with respect to teacher’s outcomes. However, other research did not examine how teacher’s TL relates to pupil’s outcomes. Consequently, the originality of this study lied in focusing on teacher’s TL behavior rather than that of the principal. Finally, Pounder (2006) also suggests that a new and broad empirical research stage regarding teacher leadership should focus on teacher’s TL qualities and TL in the school and university context. The current study took part in this research stage.

This study fills the gap in research on democratic education for middle school students in Lebanon. Lenzi et al.’s (2014) study of 403 Italian adolescents between 11 and 15 years old conclude that civic engagement is not restricted to civic education curricula. Lenzi et al. (2014) argue that few studies examine the influence of several factors of school environment on civic engagement. Moreover, most research regarding adolescence development and civics focuses on late stages rather than early and middle phases. Thus, research on a wider understanding of democratic education with respect to young adolescents was vital (Lenzi et al., 2014). Akar (2014) asserts that education aiming for active citizenship is still of prominence to ensure cohesion of society and reorganization of regions that experienced conflict, such as Lebanon. Akar’s (2014) qualitative study of 435 students in Lebanon reveals students’ views that the Lebanese civic education textbook and memorizing tasks oppose the essence of active citizenship. According to Akar (2014), active citizenship education in Lebanon is damaged through the existing classroom practices. Based on Lenzi et al. (2014) and Akar’s (2014) conclusions, the current study proposed a more comprehensive view of democratic education that focuses on characteristics other than civic education.

6 Methods
6.1 Participants
The sample was a convenient one since only a limited number of schools implement a process-based curriculum rather than the use of textbooks. The sample is also purposeful since schools were contacted based on the curriculum model that they apply. The sample consisted of 12 teachers and 301 students at the middle school level of 4 private schools operating in Lebanon in grades 6, 7, and 8. 6 teachers and 139 students belonged to process-based curriculum schools whereas 6 teachers and 161 students belonged to content-based curriculum schools. Students are at the phase of early adolescence whose ages are between 11 and 14 years old.

6.2 Materials
6.2.1 Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x-short)
The MLQ (5x) short form measures the TL behavior of teachers. MLQ has outstanding internal consistency with alpha coefficient above the 0.8 level. More than 15,000 participants completed MLQ which has been translated to several languages including German and Japanese. To measure TL behavior of teachers which is the first independent variable, the questionnaire MLQ (5x-short) is used with both its leader form that is filled by each participating teacher and a rater form filled by 8 colleagues for each participating teacher. Raters could be colleagues at a higher, lower, or same organizational level. The total number of raters should be 8 to 12 names of individuals who worked closely with or observed the leader (Mind Garden Inc, (n.d)). Both forms of MLQ (5x-short) have the same number of items. According to Mind Garden Inc, (n.d), MLQ helps researchers categorize leaders as more or less transformational but does not label leaders as transformational or not. The questionnaire; in its short form, along with a scoring key and license for reproduction by the author of this study were purchased in December, 2014 from Mind Garden, Inc. (See Appendix A)
6.2.2 Democratic Classroom Climate Scale

Democratic Classroom Climate scale is filled by middle school students regarding their classroom climate. To ensure validity of the data to be collected and for the purpose of the study, the author of the current study changed the word “school” to “classroom” after the permission of this scale’s author was granted. This scale was derived from “democratic school climate” by Samdal, Wold, and Torsheim (1998). It is composed of 5 items that assess the perception of democratic school climate (Samdal et al., 1998). All items were reversed. In Samdal’s et al study, alpha reliability for the five-item scale was 0.68. The scale was also filled by adolescents in various studies. (See Appendix B)

6.2.3 Participatory Citizenship Instrument

This instrument was filled by middle school students. According to Flanagan, Syversten, and Stout (2007), this civic measurement is strictly for the use of adolescents regarding their upcoming civic engagement. Participatory citizenship is drawn from Flanagan et al. (2007) with reliability coefficient 0.82. This instrument is composed of two stem questions; the first question includes 4 items, whereas the second stem includes 2 items. (See Appendix C)

6.3 Research Design and Procedure

This is an empirical quantitative study that is based on self-report measures. MLQ (5x) was supplemented with a questionnaire for general information about the teacher and required 10-15 minutes to complete. Democratic classroom climate scale and Participatory citizenship were combined in one questionnaire to be filled by middle school students in 7-10 minutes. A pilot study was first administered to ensure the appropriateness of surveys and directions in the context of private middle schools in Lebanon.

7 Results

Hypothesis 1: There is a positive correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and democratic classroom climate.

Pearson’s correlation was calculated between teacher’s TL behavior and democratic classroom climate. Results showed an insignificant correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and democratic classroom climate \( (r=0.017, p=0.774) \). Therefore, hypothesis 1 was not confirmed.

Hypothesis 2: There is a positive correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and middle school students’ participatory citizenship.

Pearson’s correlation was calculated between teacher’s TL behavior and middle school students’ participatory citizenship. Scores showed an insignificant correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and middle school students’ participatory citizenship \( (r=0.87, p=0.132) \). Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not confirmed.

Hypothesis 3: Process-based curriculum schools score higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on democratic classroom climate.

Independent samples t-test was performed. This hypothesis was confirmed since the independent t-test analysis revealed that the mean differences between process-based curriculum schools and non-process based curriculum schools on students’ democratic classroom climate is significant, \( t (299) =5.876 \) at \( p = .000 \).

Hypothesis 4: Process-based curriculum schools score higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on students’ participatory citizenship.
Independent Samples t-test was performed. T-test results did not reach proper significance. However, there was a marginal significance in the mean difference between process-based curriculum schools and non-process based curriculum schools on middle school students’ participatory citizenship, $t (299) =1.753$ at $p= .08$. The results show that $p > \alpha$ since $\alpha=.05$ and $p=0.08$. However, 0.08 is only 0.03 greater than $\alpha$.

7.1 Additional Analysis

Although not hypothesized, Pearson’s correlation was calculated and revealed a significant positive correlation between Democratic Classroom Climate and middle school students’ Participatory Citizenship ($r=0.271$, $p=0.00$). This finding was obtained to serve as a reflection of Gutmann’s theoretical framework in an empirical context.

Moreover, Independent samples t-test revealed a significant difference between the scores of process-based curriculum schools and non-process based curriculum schools on teacher’s Transformational Leadership behavior, $t (299) =8.144$, $p= .000$ as $p \leq \alpha$ since $\alpha=.05$ and $p=0.00$.

8 Discussions of Results

The first hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and democratic classroom climate was not confirmed in this study which contradicts previous research. The reason could be that TL in the classroom is a novel model which authors such as Treslan (2006) are still investigating. It is also probable that teachers in middle schools in Lebanon need TL training to better implement this kind of classroom leadership as Beauchamp et al. (2011) emphasizes the importance of TL training.

The second hypothesis that there is a positive correlation between teacher’s TL behavior and middle school student’s participatory citizenship was not confirmed which opposes findings of previous research. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) believed that participatory citizenship programs prepare teenagers to be active in their communities and lead future projects to reach shared societal aims. Participatory citizenship as an idea requires a projection to the future where students rate the agreement and likelihood that they will be participatory citizens based on their current participation. An act of projection to the future might not be easy to all middle school students. Ersøy (2014) believed that the student’s age, societal environment, gender, and degree of maturity all influence the application of citizenship education. Besides, some democratic classroom experiences that foster citizenship might not be part of the school systems in Lebanon which could influence the study results. Likewise, Akar (2014) believed that the current situation of civic education in Lebanon is one that hinders active citizenship.

Moreover, literature examined earlier such as that of Bass and Riggio (2006) reveals that TL; through its elements and practices of delegation creates empowerment in followers. The results of this study failed to support previous research which could be the result of ingenuin practices of TL. According to Schuh et al. (2013), TL that is not genuine also fostered the unfavorable consequences of authoritarian leadership behavior with respect to followers’ reactions and effort. Similarly, Slavich and Zimbardo (2012) affirmed that students’ educational achievement, principles, expertise, and beliefs might be notably promoted only if TL is effectively employed as an aspect of transformational teaching.

The third hypothesis that process-based curriculum schools score higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on democratic classroom climate was confirmed showing significant difference between process-based curriculum and content-based curriculum for democratic classroom climate. This finding supported previous literature and findings on the positive relationship between process-based curricula and democratic classroom climate; especially in
middle school years. According to Lim (2011), a curriculum that hosts critical thinking in the classroom is influential if problems tackled are socially significant. A problem that both yields critical thinking and serves deliberation has to be of social prominence (Lim, 2011).

A process-based curriculum rather than content-based one supports a democratic classroom climate. Tannebaum (2013) asserted that democratic practices of dialogue and controversial debates are based on theoretical views such as that of Dewey. Besides, creating knowledge of democratic practices and readiness to accept and learn from opposing views should be the primary goal of discursive education. A classroom is more community-like as students engage in dialogue through a learner-centered approach of inquiry and cooperative learning. On the other hand, Ersoy (2014) criticized a curriculum that is not process-based by arguing that another challenge to active citizenship is the teacher-centered school system. Education whose emphasis is on examination renders active citizenship theoretical. A traditional school setting that rotates around testing, laws and policies put constraints on the teachers’ possibility of discussing political matters. Consequently, negative outcomes in citizenship education occur (Ersoy, 2014). Similarly, Mossison (2008) concluded that a dispute to democratic education could be the fact that students in traditional education are not familiar with academic freedom because their input was not part of their educational experience.

The forth hypothesis that process-based curriculum schools score higher than non-process-based curriculum schools on students’ participatory citizenship with marginal significance. Westheimer and Kahne (2004) argued that through the school’s curriculum, participatory citizenship should be presented and implemented clearly to students. Lim (2011) believed that a curriculum that hosts problems that require critical thinking skills will engage the learner and liberate him/her as they underlie prominent societal matters.

Another finding of this study is that a significant difference exists between the scores of process-based curriculum schools and non-process based curriculum schools on teacher’s Transformational Leadership behavior. This finding acts as further support for process-based curriculum and transformational teaching which aligns with previous literature. Slavich and Zimbardo (2012) concluded that experiential learning, problem-based learning, active-learning, student-centered learning, and collaborative learning are diverse classroom approaches that have in common the same theoretical grounds. The authors elaborated that within this approach of transformational teaching, students play a role in developing their own learning encounters and that of their friends (Slavich& Zimbardo, 2012).

9 Classroom Implications

Bell et al. (2010) claimed that one appealing yet challenging project that schools are considering is the implementation of a curriculum that welcomes collaboration and inquiry in learning. The results of this study revealed that process-based curriculum schools perform better than content-based curriculum schools in the democratic classroom climate, participatory difference, and teacher’s TL behavior. Consequently, this study suggests that for democratic education to be fostered, curriculum is to emphasize the learning processes and encourage democratic practices. Ersoy (2014) concluded that the school is advised to carry out school-wide reform for democratic education to be transferred to out-side school settings.

The teacher in this curriculum continues to play a critical role in fostering democratic education. O’Mahony (2009) highlighted the role that teachers play in fostering active citizenship by asserting that students should be encouraged to discuss their views about public incidents. Martens and Gainous (2013) argued that for active and informed citizenship, teachers are to be aware of their classroom practices and adopt open classroom practices in order to foster the capacity
of young citizens even if they are still asked to abide by textbook instruction. Consequently, in Lebanon, private middle school teachers who are obliged to use the national textbooks and prepare students for official examination can still create a democratic classroom and prepare students for active citizenship.

Even though TL did not show a positive correlation with democratic classroom climate and participatory citizenship, it still appeared as a characteristic of process-based curriculum schools. It could be that teachers need training in TL before being asked to implement it in the classroom for favorable democratic education conditions as Beauchamp et al. (2011) recommended teachers’ in-service training in TL. Consequently, professional development in democratic education aspects is recommended for middle school teachers in Lebanon. Al Kharusi and Atweh (2012) suggested in-service training as a venue for teachers to help them create democratic classroom climate and an open learning atmosphere.

In conclusion, democratic means and democratic ends of education remain prominent to promote democratic education and help foster a democratic society as Gutmann (1987) asserted. Regardless of the mixed findings on democratic education and the challenges faced, schools, teachers, parents, and students are encouraged to support democratic education in both its means (democratic classroom climate) and ends (participatory citizenship).

Limitations

The study was based on a purposeful yet convenient sample of 4 private schools in Lebanon serving students from upper socio-economic status. In addition, the sample of teachers was a small one consisting of 12 teachers who agreed to volunteer. Therefore, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the Lebanese population of private middle school teachers and students.
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Appendix B

Democratic Classroom Climate Scale

A. Use the following rating scale. Select one number

1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Disagree, 5 = Strongly disagree.

How much do you agree with the following statements?

(1) “In our classroom students take part in making rules” ..............1 2 3 4 5

(2) “The students get involved in organizing school events”.............1 2 3 4 5

(3) “The rules in this classroom are fair”.......................................1 2 3 4 5

(4) “I am encouraged to express my own views in my class by my teacher” 1 2 3 4 5

(5) “Our teacher treats us fairly” ”..............................................1 2 3 4 5
Appendix C

Participatory Citizenship Instrument

Use the following rating scale. Select one number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How much do you agree with the following statements?
(1) Being actively involved in community issues is my responsibility………1 2 3 4 5
(2) Being concerned about state and local issues is an important responsibility for everybody…1 2 3 4 5
(3) I believe I can make a difference in my community…………………………………1 2 3 4 5
(4) By working with others in the community, I can help make things better……1 2 3 4 5

Use the following rating scale. Select one number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1= Not at all likely, 2= Unlikely, 3= Neutral, 4= Likely, 5= Extremely likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

When you think about your life after high school, how likely is it that you would do each of the following?

(1) Work with a group to solve a problem in the community where you live…1 2 3 4 5
(2) Get involved in issues like health or safety that affect your community….. 1 2 3 4 5