

Evaluation of the Citizenship Consciousness of the 8th Year Students¹

Deniz Tonga*

Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Education

Hamza Keles

Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education

Article history	The prime purpose of this study is to elucidate the awareness level of citizenship of 8 th year students. That was why the answer of the question “what is the level of citizenship consciousness of the 8 th year students” was sought. The study was designed according to the descriptive survey method with the use of a scale with 7 open ended questions developed by the authors. The scale was applied to a total of 1178 8 th year students in 12 different cities in 2012-2013 academic year. The data obtained were subjected to descriptive analyses. The results revealed that the citizenship awareness of the 8 th year students was medium and more than half of the students were oblivious about what their legal and constitutional rights were. It was determined that the students were not able to explain the human rights based on the underlying reasons. Most of the participants did not have sufficient knowledge about democracy and perceived it as general elections. It was also observed that they lacked the knowledge on the adverse behaviors in human communications and described a good citizen as the person who pays taxes, does military service, votes, and is honest and benevolent.
Received: 26.01.2014	
Received in revised form: 01.05.2014	
Accepted: 05.05.2014	
Key words: Social Studies, citizenship consciousness, human rights and responsibilities, citizen and citizenship	

Introduction

Individuals are the smallest unit of societies. Individuals come together to form families, and families come together to form societies. In this context, the stronger and healthier the individuals are, the more powerful the society is. The power of an individual stems from the fact that he/she is the prime element of the society. The individual as a social element is not only an entity sharing the output of the society, but he/she is a power who contributes to the social production. Thus an individual produces and takes his/her share from the output (Yılmaz, 2002).

The conversion of the individuals into societies requires an adaptation period. In this context, individuals do not necessarily think or act similarly but they acquire and adsorb the common values of the society (Kıncal, 2012). The socialization would only be meaningful if the humans become cognizant of their skills and virtues, develop and put them at the service of the society and the humanity (Giddens, 2009). Education is the most important factor which

¹This study is the extension of the PhD study entitled “Evaluation of the Levels of Citizenship Consciousness of Students Grade 8 in Terms of Several Variables “ completed under the supervision of Prof. Dr. Hamza KELES

*Correspondence: Department of Social Studies Education, Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Education, Kırıkkale, Turkey, deniztonga@hotmail.com, +905466492357

enables the individuals to take part in the society in a position compatible with their skills and virtues.

Particularly, the children who start primary school begin to learn social rules, rights, and freedoms, bating their egos and establishing communication with each other. In other words, they learn there how to comply with social rules. Therefore, the school is an important institution which tries to furnish the students with the knowledge, skills, and values expected from good citizens (Bozkurt, 2013).

However, the school functions as a bridge between the family medium and bigger social institutions. Apart from acquiring diversified skills and virtues, the children recognize the new friend and other regulators in the school rather than their own families. There, they also encounter different modes of behaviors, customs, and traditions for the first time in their lives. The students become used to the behaviors and reactions of their friends, teachers and administrators and begin to learn the social texture that exists among them. The virtues gained there form a sub-structure for their future life (Ergün, 1994). Therefore, the education of the people is of utmost importance since it creates the platform to become a good citizen and person.

The most basic form of citizenship is being the member of a country, state or a similar political institution. Although the definition is simple, it has a very complicated structure. In order to clarify the concept, we must first define what the society or the community is and its uses, the rights emerged from being a member of it, and the responsibilities it imposes upon us (Halstead and Pike, 2006).

According to McCovan (2009), the term of citizenship has two different meanings. The first one defines the official status of a person; e.g. “I am Turkish”, “I am British” or “I have dual citizenship”. The second one quotes the official duties and responsibilities of a person. For instance, the participation in political life is regarded as an effective citizenship, and being indifferent to the violations of human rights is seen as ineffective citizenship.

Citizenship is a multi-dimensional and complicated concept which includes legal, cultural, social, and political factors and covers social bindings, identities, rights, and responsibilities. In its classical description, the citizenship indicates the balance between the rights and responsibilities of citizens and social integration (Ichilov, 1998). In another description, the citizenship is said to be composed by four dimensions: namely status, identity, virtues of citizenship, and political participation. The status is related to the affiliation of a political organization. The identity refers to the loyalty and belonging to a political association. The virtues of the citizenship mean the compliance to the social rules and displaying the attitudes and behaviors expected from good citizens. Finally, the political participation is the participation to civil and political life (Schugurensky, 2010).

The social, economic, cultural, and political structures of the developed countries are largely determined by the schools. While the schools are effected by the social changes and developments, they are also the sites where these changes are initiated. In other words, the schools both start and are effected by all these changes (Yeşil, 2002).

The basic educational institutes, in other words schools, are expected to furnish the people with the virtues and the responsibilities of good citizen and promote the relations between the people. The social studies course has an important responsibility in the realization of all these goals (Ragan and McAulay, 1964). This is due to the fact that social studies sources are

directly related to the training of good citizens.

There are many topics in social studies course emphasizing the importance of being a good citizen. (Barth, Barr and Shermis, 1977; Doğanay, 2004; NCSS, 2014; Savage and Armstrong, 2000; Ross, 2006). This is due to the fact that the social studies concept first appeared in America in order to bring up good citizens. The course is entirely related to furnishing the students with the consciousness of being good citizens. The first stage of this course is the information stage. The students are first taught what the human rights are, and they apply these in their personal lives.

The goal of the study

The goal of this study was to elucidate the knowledge and awareness level of 8th year student in the context of the citizenship concept. Every country thrives for training good citizens for the continuation of their existence. The social studies course serves for this very purpose. This study is important as regards to the determination of the quality of the information acquired by the students in this course and whether this course serves the purpose which it was originally designed for.

In democratic societies, the citizens are expected to access the knowledge and use it appropriately (Barth and Demirtaş, 1997). The quality of knowledge related to citizenship and human rights, the features of good citizens, their rights and freedoms, and the place of democracy in human life are of utmost importance. Any misinformation or misconception may result in the emergence of undesired behaviors in the society. That is why the quality of the knowledge acquired by the students is of paramount importance. Therefore, determining how much social studies course, the direct aim of which is to educate good citizens in Turkey, serves for this purpose will contribute to future program/content studies.

Method

The research model

Due to the fact that this study aims to find out the level of knowledge the students possess in the context of citizenship consciousness as a part of the social studies course in Turkey, it was preferred to use descriptive survey model which would state the research aim in the best possible way. This study was carried out by the use of the descriptive survey research model. The survey models are generally based upon the description of a phenomenon in the past or present without any modification (Karasar, 2013).

Working group

The participants of the this search were constituted by a total of 1178 eighth year students, 586 female and 592 male, selected by the maximum diversity sampling method. The sampling method which is based upon maximum diversity does not create diversity to make generalizations but tries to establish similarities between the diversified situations and elucidate the different dimensions of the problem. (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2008).

The regional structure of Turkey determined by TSI (Turkish Statistical Institute) and 1st level of this structure were used in sampling based upon the maximum diversity. In the first level, Turkey is separated into 12 regions as Istanbul, West Marmara, Aegean, East Marmara,

West Anatolia, Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, West Black Sea, East Anatolia, North East Anatolia, Middle East Anatolia, and South East Anatolia. In the second level, there are 26 regions, and in the third level, there are 81 provinces (TSI, 2014).

Then the sampling studies based on the prioritized regions were carried out by the use of NUTS 1 (Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics). There was one province chosen from each region by taking the transportability, economics, and easy application into account. The provinces chosen for sampling were as follows: İstanbul, Çanakkale, Muğla, Eskişehir, Ankara, Kahramanmaraş, Kayseri, Zonguldak, Samsun, Trabzon, Erzurum, Malatya, Gaziantep.

Table 1. The distribution of the participants according to provinces

No	Regions (Nuts 1 / 12 Region)	Province	F	%
1	Istanbul	Istanbul	104	8.8
2	West Marmara	Çanakkale	104	8.8
3	Aegean	Muğla	97	8.2
4	East Marmara	Eskişehir	84	7.1
5	West Anatolia	Ankara	102	8.7
6	Mediterranean	Antalya	91	7.7
7	Central Anatolia	Kayseri	90	7.6
8	West Black Sea	Samsun	97	8.2
9	East Black Sea	Trabzon	101	8.6
10	Northwestern Anatolia	Erzurum	99	8.4
11	Middle East Anatolia	Malatya	106	9.0
12	North East Anatolia	Gaziantep	103	8.7
Total			1178	100

Data collection tools

There was an open ended scale with seven questions in the study in order to determine the level of 8th year students' knowledge about the citizenship concept. The reason to use open ended questions was the desire to carry out a more detailed investigation on the answers of the students in order to have a much accurate picture about the awareness levels of the participants. The students were asked to give their answers to these open ended questions in written format (Güler, 2011).

Expert opinion was consulted in order to gain validity and reliability in the research. The first stage of the development of the open ended questions was to present the gains in 6th and 7th years of the social studies course to 13 experts as a list for their opinions. The themes were formed by the use of the most repeated gains and values among the answers received. Then questions were prepared according to the topics of the themes, and the experts were consulted again. The experts were chosen among people with masters or PhDs on citizenship or human rights or from academic staff teaching these topics in universities. The field experts were asked to determine whether the questions were related to the citizenship, and the linguistic experts were asked to find any grammatical or comprehensive mistakes which would cause any misunderstandings. There were 7 field, 5 measurement and evaluation, and 5 linguistic experts contributed to the study. The scale evolved into its final form by taking all these opinions into consideration.

Data collection process

After detecting provinces for the research, the schools from which data would be collected, were detected. Receipts of permissions taken from Ministry of Education were sent to these schools after making contact. 2 or 3 classes from each school have contributed to the research. Before collecting data, a directive was issued to the teachers who would implement the study, and they were requested to inform students about the research.

Volunteering among students was sought while applying the scale tool. The aim of the study was explained briefly to the students, and it was stated that their sincere answers were important for the study.

The analysis of the data

The open ended questions were graded according to the pre-determined “Analytical Grading key” prepared by taking the experts’ opinions. The key contained the grading of the answers to the questions, important opinions, and sub-answers accordingly. The answer key thus obtained is known as the “grading key” or the “analytical grading key” (Turgut and Baykul, 2011). The analytical grading key was sent to two measurement and evaluation experts and two field experts, and it was given its final form according to their suggestions. The highest and lowest points scorable in this scale were 0 and 100, respectively. The authors randomly selected papers to be read by three experts, and the points given by the experts and the author were observed for consistency. The data obtained from the open ended questions were subjected to a descriptive analysis. During the analysis, the author received answers from 1240 participants. The question forms were roughly scanned before analysis, and 62 scales were omitted due to being haphazardly-filled or unanswered.

Findings

Table 2. The descriptive data of the open ended questions

N	The lowest grade	The highest grade	\bar{X}	S
1178	10	94	48.43	20.36

Table 2 lists the descriptive data of the grades scored by the students in the open ended questions: the lowest and the highest grades were 10 and 94, respectively and the mean score was $\bar{X}=48.42$.

The answers given to the question 1

a. *What are the freedoms and rights you have now?*

Table 3. The answers given to the part (a) of question 1

The grades obtained from Q1(a)	f	%
0 (No answer or the wrong answer)	100	8.5
3 (Gave one example)	159	13.5
6 (Gave two examples)	255	21.6

As from	9 (Gave three or more examples)	664	56.4	seen
	Total	1178	100.0	Table

3, 8.5% of the participants (n=100) have no idea about the rights and freedoms they have. 13.5% (n=159) of the students gave only one example, 21.6 % (n=255) gave two examples, and 56.4 % (n=664) gave three or more examples related to their freedoms and the rights. The most popular examples given by the students were “the right to live”, “election and political rights”, “educational rights”, “travelling and settlement rights”.

b. What can you say about the rights and freedoms you have?

Table 4. 1. The answers given to the part (b) of Q1

Table shows 24 %	The grades obtained from Q.1(b)	F	%	4 that
	0 (No answer or wrong answer)	283	24.0	
3 (Stating only the importance of it)	432	36.7		
7 (Explaining with examples)	325	27.6		
10 (evaluation with underlying reasons)	138	11.7		
Total	1178	100		

(n=283) of the students are not aware of the importance of the human rights, freedoms and responsibilities. 36.7 % (n=432) answered as “the human rights and responsibilities are important” without making any further explanation. 27.6 % (n=325) of the participants explained it with examples. Only 11.7 % (n=138) of the participants evaluated the importance of human rights and responsibilities with the underlying reasons and got the full marks.

c. Can you give examples for the national and international documents which guarantee the human rights and freedoms?

Table 5. The answers given to Q1(c)

The grades obtained from Q.1(c)	f	%
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	588	49.9
3 (Gave one example)	301	25.6
6 (Gave two examples)	235	19.9
9 (Gave three examples)	54	4.6
Total	1178	100

According to Table 5, 49.9 % of the students (n=588) failed to answer this question or gave the wrong answer. 25.6 % of them (n=301) gave one, 19.9 % (n=235) gave two, and 4.6 % of them (n=54) gave three examples. The most quoted examples were “children rights convention”, “human rights convention” and “the constitution”.

Q2. What are the differences between the countries which are led by the kingdom and by democracy?

Table 6. The answers given to Q2

The grades obtained from Q.2	F	%
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	155	13.2
4 (Answered to only one type of administration correctly)	166	14.1
8 (Answered to both types of administration correctly)	659	55.9
12 (Explained and compared both types of administration)	185	15.7
16 (Explained the superiorities of democracy by giving relevant reasons)	13	1.1
Total	1178	100

Table 6 shows that 13 % of the students (n=155) couldn't answer the question correctly. 14.1 % of them could only explain one type of administration correctly, 55.9 % of them explained and compared both, and 1,1 % of them both compared them and explained the superiority of democracy with relevant reasons. The students regarded the democracy and kingdom as the administration of people and one person, respectively.

Q3. What do you think the behaviors which adversely effect the communication between people are?

Table 7. The answers given to the Q3

The grades obtained from Q.3	F	%	seen Table % of
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	259	22.0	
4 (Gave one example)	262	22.2	
8 (Gave two examples)	317	26.9	
12 (Gave three examples)	340	28.9	
Total	1178	100	

students (n=259) failed to give the correct answer. 22.2 % (n=262) gave only one example, 26.9 % (n=317) provided two examples, and 28.9 % (n=340) answered with three examples and got the full mark. Among the most popular answers given by the participants were "using an informal language, failure to establish empathy, shouting and swearing".

Q4. What would you say about the excessive use of natural resources?

Table 8. The answers given to Q4

The grades obtained from Q.3	F	%
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	269	22.8
3 (Just answered that they were harmful)	496	42.1
7 (Gave some examples about its harms)	330	28.0

10 (Evaluated the dangers with examples)	83	7.0
Total	1178	100

Table 8 indicates that 22.8 % of the participants (n=269) could not provide answers about the consequences of excessive use of natural resources. 42.1 % of them (n=496) merely stated that “the excessive use of natural resources is harmful” or “we must refrain from the excessive use of natural resources.” without giving any explanations. 28 % of the participants (n=330) gave examples for the excessive use of natural resources. Only 7 % (n=83) evaluated the consequences of the excessive use of natural resources with the possible damages it may cause on human lives. Amongst the answers about the excessive use of natural resources are “there will be nothing left to the future generations” and “if we unconsciously waste them today, we may not be able to replace them tomorrow“.

Q5. Assume that you are invited to a penal entitled “democracy and school” as a speaker. What sort of examples would you give from your school when it was your turn to speak?

Table 9. The answers given to the Q 5

The grades obtained from Q.5	F	%
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	413	35.1
4 (Gave only one example)	357	30.3
8 (Gave two examples)	257	21.8
12 (Gave three examples)	151	12.8
Total	1178	100

As seen in Table 9, 35.1 % of the students either gave a wrong answer or answered it as “there is no democracy in our school”. 30.3 % (n=357) gave one, 21.8 % (n=257) gave two, and 12.8 % (n=151) gave three examples. The most popular answers given by the students were the election of the school president for the students and the election of the classroom president. The answers indicate that most of the students perceive democracy as elections. A small portion of the students regarded democracy as the equality, the consideration of their opinion by the administrative staff, and being treated equally by teachers.

Q6. Do you think that paying taxes is necessary? Would you explain it to us by giving relevant reasons?

Table 10. The answers given to Q6

The grades obtained from Q.3	F	%
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	192	16.3
3 (Said that it is just necessary)	190	16.1
6 (Said that it is the duty of every citizen)	165	14.0
7 (Emphasized its contribution the countries’ economy)	396	33.6
10 (Said that it is the duty of every citizen and explained its contribution to the economy of the country with relevant examples)	235	19.9

The grades obtained from Q.3	F	%
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	192	16.3
3 (Said that it is just necessary)	190	16.1
6 (Said that it is the duty of every citizen)	165	14.0
7 (Emphasized its contribution the countries' economy)	396	33.6
10 (Said that it is the duty of every citizen and explained its contribution to the economy of the country with relevant examples)	235	19.9
Total	1178	100

As seen from Table 10, 16.3% of the students (n=192) either did not give any answer or stated that giving taxes was not necessary. 16.1% of them (n=190) simply stated that it was necessary without giving any reasons. 14% (n=165) emphasized that giving taxes is a duty incumbent upon every citizen, and 33.6% of them (n=396) emphasized its contribution to the economy of the country. 19.9% of them (n=235) both stated that it was a duty incumbent upon every citizen and explained its contribution to the economy of the country with relevant examples.

Q7. Suppose your teacher asked you to describe a good citizen. What would you say about the virtues a good citizen should have?

Table 11. The answers given to Q7

The grades obtained from Q.6	f	%
0 (No answers or wrong answer)	220	18.7
3 (Gave only one example)	111	9.4
6 (Gave two examples)	225	19.1
9 (Gave three examples)	287	24.4
12 (Gave four examples)	335	28.4
Total	1178	100

Table 11 shows that 18.7% of the participants (n=220) did not answer the question, and 9.4% (n=111) gave one example, 19.1% (n=225) gave two examples, 24.4% (n=287) gave three examples, and 28.4% (n=335) gave four examples. Among the popular answers were “giving taxes”, “casting votes”, “being honesty”, and “benevolence”.

Discussion and Conclusion

An open ended scale with seven questions was applied to the 8th year students to measure their citizenship awareness and knowledge levels. The mean score of the participants was 48.43 out of 100. This result indicates that the overall citizenship awareness level of the students was average, and the detailed examination of the results revealed the fact that the citizenship awareness levels of the students were not adequate. The brief summary of the answers of the students to the open ended questions is given below:

When we examine the answers given to the question “what are the freedoms and rights you

have now?" it is seen that 60.7% of the participants were not fully aware of the details. Sönmez, Kaymakçı, and Merey (2010) reported that the pre-service teachers did not fully conceive the human rights and freedoms.

Nearly half of the participants, 49.9% (n=588) failed to give any answers to the question "can you give examples to the national and international documents which guarantee the human rights and freedoms". The most popular answers were "children rights' convention", "human rights convection" and "the constitution". The percentage of "constitution" among these answers is lower than the others. The students must be taught the fact that the freedom and rights are first protected and guaranteed by the Turkish Republic and its constitution before anything else.

The general evaluation of the first question related to the rights and freedoms showed that half of the participants were not aware of them, did not appreciate their values, and could not name any documents securing them. This indicates that the students did not acquire the gains of the course adequately, and the ones they acquired were not sufficient. The fact that the students lack the knowledge on the freedoms and the rights which form the very foundations of the citizenship may cause serious problems in the use of these rights and freedoms in their lives. Majority of the teachers stated that there are not enough subjects related to citizenship and human rights in textbook, in the study conducted by Ülger (2012). Moreover, guidebooks of teacher were evaluated to be insufficient on this issue. Besides, it is thought that student's being insufficient about this subject is directly related to curriculum and applications in the class.

The answers given to the question "what are the differences between a country which is led by the kingdom and a country which is led by democracy?" indicated that the most of the students simply thought that the kingdom is the administration of the country by a single person while democracy was the power of the people. This shows that the students did not learn the terms related to democracy sufficiently and did not internalize them. Students expressed that there is not democracy in daily life, in the study conducted by Kiroğlu (2013). Accordingly the results of studies are substantially similar to each other.

The answers to the question "what do you think the behaviors which adversely affect the communication between people are" revealed the fact that nearly half of the students did not know the behaviors which adversely affect the communication between people. This is a serious problem as regard to the citizenship concept. It is because if we consider the fact that people live in communities and establish communication with their environment, the fact that people with weak communication skills are not a desired situation to have. Among the most popular answers given by the students were "using an unofficial language", "failure to establish empathy", and "shouting and swearing". Çelikkaya (2011) reported that the students partially acquired the communication skills which are quite compatible with the findings of this study.

The answers given to the question "what would you say about the excessive use of natural resources" revealed that nearly one quarter of the participants has very little knowledge about the excessive use of our natural resources. The fact that the question was correctly answered by only 35% of the participants clearly shows that the students have not achieved this gain of the program. The most popular answers given to this question were "there will be nothing left to the future generations" or "if we unconsciously waste them today, we may not be able to replace them tomorrow". Çelik (2010) has reached to the result in his study that there is not enough implementations about environmental consciousness. However, the results stated by

Gömleksiz and Cüro (2011) shows the opposite. They reported that the social studies course has a positive contribution to the adaptation of the positive attitudes towards nature by the primary school students. When the results are compared, they are seen to be important for applications at school to gain value.

35.1% of the students either gave a wrong answer or answered it as “there is no democracy in our school” to the question “Assume that you are invited to a penal entitled democracy and school as a speaker. What sort of examples would you give from your school when it was your turn to speak?” The answers given to this question were generally related to the elections in the school. They frequently answered this question as the election of “the president or the vice president for the student council.” Starting from this point, it is clear that the opinions of the students were shaped largely by elections. The fact that nearly 65% of the students has very little knowledge about the democracy can be attributed to two reasons. The first reason is that it is actually the case that the school does not have any democratic activities in the school, and the second one is that the students lack the knowledge on what is democratic and what is not and failed to give a relevant answer. A very small portion of the students stated that the democracy was the equality and related it to their opinions being taken in to account and all the students being treated equally. Sarı and Sadık (2011) reported that most of the pre-service teachers stated that there were no activities in the school related to the democracy, and the ones who had these activities said that they had been briefed about it. Kuş (2012) reported that the students emphasized the election, equality, diversity and freedom concepts related to democracy. Thianthai (2012) concluded that the conception of the democracy by the students is rather focused on casting votes, civil rights, freedoms, equality, and justice.

Among the answers given to the question “Suppose your teacher asked you to describe a good citizen. What would you say about the virtues a good citizen should have?” are paying taxes, voting, doing military service, being honesty, and benevolence. The answers such as doing the military service or paying taxes are not compatible with the ages of the secondary education students. Therefore, it is important that the student should be taught the responsibilities and the duties in accordance to their ages. O’Brien and Smith (2011) reported that the students regarded these virtues as social participation, complying with the rules, political activity, casting votes, being respectful to the others, and following the daily events. Arrowood Schultheis (2011) indicated that the students regarded the virtues of a good citizen as being respectful, honest, casting votes, and paying taxes. Alazzi (2012) reported that the students answered the question “who the good citizen was” as the person who respects others, behaves patriotically, cleans the environment, and obeys the rules.

When the results are evaluated, it is seen that social studies lesson is not at the desired level in bringing about citizenship awareness to the students. Especially acquisition of the knowledge related to citizenship and there problems at analyses, synthesis and evaluation stages. This problem is assessed as there are not enough related subjects in textbooks or teachers do not do enough applications about these issues.

Social studies lesson is a lesson directly related to the daily life in respect of the subjects and their aims it includes. Thus, the lesson’s reaching its target means increase of good people and good citizens. And this is only related to accuracy of the knowledge given to the students and carrying it to the daily life.

Recommendations

- The old dated expository way of presenting the knowledge about the citizenship and human rights issues is not sufficient to establish a citizenship consciousness in the

people. That is why the subjects should be presented in stepwise manner as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation stages. That may facilitate the students to internalize these subjects.

- Democracy should not only be taken as a concept related to the elections. Today democracy is accepted as a way of life. Therefore the activities in the school should not only be limited to elections but also emphasize the democratic values. It is recommended that the students should be treated equally and their opinions should be taken into account for the illustration of democracy.
- One of the most important concepts about the citizenship consciousness or awareness is the communication. The students establish communication with others in every walk of life such as shopping, official organizations, schools and their families. The communication between the people is therefore of great importance. That is why it is important that the social studies courses should include the examples about the factors which positively or negatively affect the communication between the people. Also the activities on the communication in everyday life should be enumerated.
- The concept of “good citizen” should be emphasized frequently during the social studies courses and activities should be prepared to illustrate the features that the good citizens should have. This may help the engrave this concept in the brains of the students in the most solid form.
- The citizenship consciousness is also involved with the protection of the natural habitat, the environment and natural resources. There may be seminars organized in order to enlighten the students about these subjects.

References

- Alazzi, K. (2012). Students Perceptions of Good Citizenship: A Study of Middle and High School Students in Jordan. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol.31 No.2 (2012), pp. 223-230.
- Arrowood Schultheis, C. M. (2011). *Citizenship Knowledge and Perceptions Of Exiting Middle School Students*. Unpublished master’s thesis. The Faculty of the College of Education. Ohio University, Ohio.
- Barr, R. Barth, J. L. & Shermis, S. S. (1978). *The Nature of Social Studies*. California: ETC Publications.
- Barth, J. & Demirtaş, A, (1997). İlköğretim Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretimi. [Teaching Elementary Social Studies]. Ankara: YÖK Yayınları.
- Bozkurt, V. (2013). *Değişen Dünyada Sosyoloji*. [Sociology in a Changing World]. Bursa: Ekin Basım Yayın Dağıtım.
- Çelik, F. (2010). *5. Sınıf Sosyal Bilgiler Programında Sorumluluk, Estetik ve Doğal Çevreye Duyarlılık Değerlerinin Kazandırılmasına İlişkin Öğrenci ve Öğretmen Görüşleri*. [Students' and teachers views about the acquisition process of responsibility, esthetic and sensitivity values to natural environment in the primary school 5th grade social sciences program]. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi. Unpublished master’s thesis. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Anadolu Üniversitesi. Eskişehir.
- Çelikkaya, T. (2011). Sosyal Bilgiler Programında Yer Alan Becerilerin Kazandırılma Düzeyi: Öğretmen Görüşleri. [Transmission Level of Skills in The Social Studies

- Curriculum: The teacher's Opinions]. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*. Cilt: 19. Eylül 2011, No: 3, 969-990.
- Doğanay, A. (2004). Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretimi. [Teaching Social Studies] C. Öztürk ve D. Dilek. (Ed.). *Hayat Bilgisi ve Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretimi*. [Knowledge of Life and Social Studies Teaching]. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Ergün, M. (1994). *Eğitim Sosyolojisine Giriş*. [Introduction to Sociology of Education] Ankara: Ocak Yayınları.
- Giddens, A. (2008). Sosyoloji. [Sociology]. İstanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları
- Gömlüksiz, M. N. & Cüro, E. (2011). Sosyal Bilgiler Dersi Öğretim Programında Yer Alan Değerlere İlişkin Öğrenci Tutumlarının Değerlendirilmesi. [An Assessment of Students' Attitudes towards Values in Social Studies Curriculum] *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, Cilt:8, Sayı:1.
- Güler, N. (2011). *Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme*. [Educational Measurement and Evaluation]. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Halstead, J. M. & Pike, M. A. (2006). *Citizenship and Moral Education*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Ichilov, O. (1998). *Citizenship and Citizenship Education in a Changing World*. London: The Woburn Press.
- Karasar, N. (2013). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. [Methods of Scientific Research] Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Kıncal, R. (2012). *Vatandaşlık Bilgisi*. [Citizenship Knowledge]. Ankara: Nobel Yayın ve Dağıtım.
- Kıroğlu, K. (2013). Is My Social Studies Teacher Democratic? *Eğitim Araştırmaları– Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 50, 127-142.
- Kuş, Z. (2012). *İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Demokrasi Algularının Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Unpublished Phd thesis. [Exploring of Middle School Students' Democracy Perceptions According to Different Variables]. Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- McCovan, T. (2009). *Rethinking Citizenship Education*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) (2014). *Creating Effective Citizens*. National Council for the Social Studies. <http://www.ncss.org/positions/effectivecitizens>
- O'Brien, J. L. & Smith J. M. (2011). Elementary Education Students' Perceptions of "Good" Citizenship. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*. 2(1), pp. 21-36.
- Ragan, W. B. & McAulay, J. D. (1964). *Social Studies for Today's Children*. New York: Meredith Publishing Company.
- Ross, E.W. (2006). *The Social Studies Curriculum*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Sarı, M. & Sadık, F. (2011). Öğretmen Adaylarının Demokrasi Algıları (Çukurova Üniversitesi Örneği). [Democracy Perceptions of Teacher Candidates: Çukurova University Sample]. *Uluslararası Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Çalışmaları Dergisi*, Cilt: 1, Sayı: 2. s. 67-82. (in Turkish)
- Savage, T. V. & Armstrong, D. G. (2000). *Effective Teaching in Elementary Social Studies*. The USA: The Prentice Hall.
- Schugurensky, D. (2010). Citizenship and Immigrant Education. Kjell R. (Ed). *Adult Learning and Education*. USA: Elsevier Academic Press.

- Sönmez, Ö. F. Kaymakcı, S. & Merey, Z. (2010). 1998 ve 2006 Sosyal Bilgiler Lisans Programlarına Göre Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmen Adaylarının Vatandaşlık Bilgisi Öğretiminde Kullanılan Bazı Kavramları Anlama Düzeyi. [Social Sciences Teacher Candidates' Levels of Understanding of Some Concepts Used in The Teaching of Knowledge of Citizenship According To The Social Sciences Undergraduate Programmes Of 1998 and 2006]. *Sosyal Bilimler Araştırmaları Dergisi*. 1, 2010. s. 126-138.
- Thianthai, C. (2012). *Perceptions of Democracy among Thai Adolescents*. <http://www.southeastasianstudies.uni-freiburg.de/Content/files/occasional-paper-series/op9-chulanee-feb2012.pdf>.
- Turgut, M. F. & Baykul, Y. (2011). *Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme*. [Educational Measurement and Evaluation]. Ankara Pegem Akademi Yayınları.
- Turkish Statistical Institute. (TSI) (2014). <http://tuikapp.tuik.gov.tr/DIESS/SiniflamaSurumDetayAction.do?sorumId=164> (in Turkish)
- Ülger, M (2012). *İlköğretim Okullarında İnsan Hakları ve Vatandaşlık Eğitimi Uygulamalarının Değerlendirilmesi* [The Evaluation of Human Right and Citizenship Education Practices at Primary Schools]. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi. Unpublished Phd thesis. Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü. Gazi Üniversitesi. Ankara.
- Yeşil, R. (2002). *Okul ve Ailede Demokrasi ve İnsan Hakları Eğitimi*. [In School and Family Democracy and Human Rights Education]. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Yıldırım, A. Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*. [Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences]. Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yılmaz, D. (2002). *Vatandaşlık Bilgisi*. [Citizenship Knowledge]. Konya: Çizgi Kitabevi.