İSTANBUL UNIVERSITY CERRAHPAŞA

HAYEF: Journal of Education, 20(2); 137-147

DOI: 10.5152/hayef.2023.20
Received: September 16, 2022
Accepted: January 25, 2023
Publication Date: June 14, 2023

HAYEF: Journal of Education

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Secondary School Students' Use of Social Studies Course Citizenship Achievements in Their Daily Lives

Zehra İLER[1], Arife Figen ERSOY[2]

[1]Anadolu University, Türkiye
[2]Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Education, Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, Eskişehir, Türkiye

Abstract

The purpose of the study is to investigate how secondary school students use the social studies course citizenship achievements in their daily lives. One thousand one hundred twelve eighth-grade students studying in secondary schools in the central districts of Diyarbakır in the 2018–2019 academic year and 21 social studies course teachers working in these schools were the participants of the study, which was conducted using converging parallel design, one of the mixed methods. "Secondary School Students' Use of Social Studies Course Citizenship Achievements in Their Daily Lives Questionnaire" and semi-structured interviews with teachers were used to collect the data. The study's findings revealed that the students exhibited less participation in expressing their thoughts and social participation behaviors in their daily lives. It was found that the socioeconomic setting, parents' education levels, their profession, and the number of siblings all have an impact on how well students use the citizenship achievements they have learned in the social studies course in their daily life. Teachers, on the other hand, stated that students are interested in rights and responsibilities, that students fail to fulfill their responsibilities, and that students encounter problems as they use their citizenship achievements in their daily lives because of the environment, the educational system, their families, teachers, and other students. According to the findings of the study, it is suggested that teachers should design teaching activities related to citizenship achievements in the social studies course that they may use in the classroom, at school, and in the surrounding community and that they can connect these activities to the daily lives of the students.

Keywords: Citizenship, citizenship education, daily life, social studies

Introduction

In the process of learning, life experiences in informal settings are just as important as those in formal settings. Daily life learning, which is a natural learning process, is a significant component of informal learning (Güleç et al., 2012). Daily life conditions and realities have an impact on how children construct their behavior as well as how they make sense of their lives with the knowledge they acquire in formal education (White, 2009). Children's acquisition of citizenship competences is greatly facilitated by context, relationships, and tendencies in daily life (Biesta et al., 2009). Daily life makes up a learning space in which children and young people experience citizenship, conceptualize it, and interpret and use the citizenship competencies they acquired through formal education.

The social environment that children interact with on a daily basis, including their family, friends, peers, teachers, and people they meet in other social communities, is crucial to the development of their citizenship competencies (Kerr, 2005, p. 88). Vygotsky (1978) claimed that in the area of proximal development, children's communication with their close environment will influence how their knowledge and skills develop. In this context, children and young people experience citizenship informally by actively participating in politics and society (Harris et al., 2010) in their daily lives. At the same time, democracy is the way of living together in a society and a system for citizens to make decisions in their daily lives. In this regard, democracy is a form of behavior that takes place in the family, school, neighborhood, and social environment in daily life, and citizenship in democratic countries also includes daily life. In this context, children's daily life experiences, citizenship, and democracy have an impact on the development of their knowledge, perception, belief, and competence (Council of Europe [CoE], 2005). Thus, in the formal education process, the daily life process should be perceived as a field of practice, and citizenship education activities should be designed to include daily life practices. Furthermore, it is important to provide children with a citizenship education that may meet their needs while also considering their daily living conditions.

Social studies course is a top priority in primary school for children to develop citizenship awareness. This course is a field of study that was created by integrating social and human sciences [National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), 1994] that provides students with knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values necessary to thrive in the

This study was presented at the International Pegem Conference on Education (IPCEDU) on September 16–19, 2020.

Corresponding Author: Arife Figen ERSOY, **E-mail:** arifee@anadolu.edu.tr; afigenersoy@gmail.com

Cite this article as: Iler, Z., & Ersoy, A. F., (2023). Secondary school students' use of social studies course citizenship achievements in their daily lives. *HAYEF: Journal of Education*, 20(2), 137-147.

This article was produced from the first author's master's thesis.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
Available online at https://hayefjournal.org

society (Boyle-Baise & Zevin, 2009) in order to raise effective and responsible citizens. This course helps students develop the responsibility and rational decision-making skills required for an active citizen in a democratic society (Boyle-Baise & Zevin, 2009). At the same time, it gives students the opportunity to comprehend life, examine problems critically, and gain knowledge through a variety of social interactions. With the help of this course, students learn to recognize and make sense of different people, places, cultures, problems, disasters, and systems in the world (Parker, 2010). Students are expected to comment, understand, take responsibility, and take action on real-life problems in order to receive a meaningful social science education (NCSS, 2016). These characteristics make social studies a course that is closely related to daily life.

In Türkiye, the vision of the social studies course curriculum, which was updated with a constructivist approach in 2005, is stated to raise competent and activecitizens who are aware of their rights and responsibilities (MoNE, 2005). Social studies course achievements are important for educating students to be engaged citizens. In the social studies course curriculum, citizenship achievements focused on the learning areas of "Individual and Society," "Groups, Institutions, and Social Organizations," and "Power, Management, and Society" and, in the 2018 curriculum, in the learning area of "Active Citizenship." One of the main sources of information for students to apply their learning about citizenship to their daily lives is the social studies course. For this reason, the question of how students use the citizenship achievements they have acquired in the social studies course in their daily lives is raised as a research topic.

When the research on citizenship was examined, the structure and the socioeconomic status of the family, where children spend a significant portion of their daily lives, have a significant impact on how aware of their citizenship responsibilities they become (Beck & Jennings, 1982; Verba et al., 2003). Mothers in particular are very effective in the citizenship development of their children (Ersoy, 2012). Students from higher education and socioeconomic backgrounds are more likely to participate in politics (Alkan, 1998; Brown, 2003; Kalaycıoğlu, 1983), and they acquire citizenship achievements such as citizenship, democracy, rights and freedoms, and duties and responsibilities (Baştürk, 2011; Kontaş, 2009; Sabancı, 2008); it is seen that they use these citizenship achievements such as democracy awareness and rights and freedoms more in their daily lives (Gömleksiz & Kan, 2008; Gömleksiz & Çetintaş, 2011; Tonga, 2013). However, children living in a crowded family environment internalize citizenship values like cooperation, respect, tolerance, and love as they find more sharing environments and incorporate them into their lifestyle. Additionally, the democratic mindset grows as the number of siblings increases (Gömleksiz & Çetintaş, 2011). If we consider that daily life differs depending on context and cultural surroundings, it is evident that there is a need for studies on citizenship in daily life in different places and cultures. When the literature on daily life and citizenship is examined, it becomes clear that while there are studies abroad directly related to the citizenship behaviors of students in their daily lives (Biesta et al., 2009; Clark & Percy-Smith, 2006; Harris et al., 2007; Print, 1999; Smith et al., 2005; van Deth 2013; Wood, 2014), there are very few studies on this subject in Türkiye (İbrahimoğlu, 2019). Thus, it is evident that citizenship education should be explored in daily life with different dimensions, including family, social environment, and institutions, and in different contexts. This study aimed to identify how secondary school students in the Diyarbakır province use citizenship achievements from the social studies curriculum in their daily lives and the factors affecting them, the problems they encountered, and suggestions they made. Within the scope of this study, answers to the following questions were investigated:

1. How do students use the citizenship skills they learned in their social studies class in their daily lives?
2. Is there a relationship between the use of citizenship achievements in the social studies course in their daily lives and the socioeconomic environment, the education level of the parents, the parents' profession, and the number of siblings in the family?
3. What are the teachers' views on the use of citizenship achievements in the social studies course in students' daily lives, the problems they encountered, and their suggestions?

Method

Research Design

A converging parallel design, which is one of the mixed-methods designs in which quantitative and qualitative data are simultaneously collected and interpreted, was used in this study (Creswell, 2012). In the quantitative dimension, secondary school students' social studies course citizenship achievements and their use in their daily lives were determined by developing a questionnaire, and in the qualitative dimension, semi-structured interviews were used to examine how social studies teachers' perspectives on citizenship knowledge, skills, and values were reflected in their students' behaviors in daily life and the problems they encountered.

Study Group

In the quantitative dimension of the study, the students who were selected by the cluster sampling method from a total of 30,681 eighth-grade students in Diyarbakır were examined. It was determined that a sample size of 652 people would be sufficient to adequately represent the entire population (Şahin, 2009); in this regard, the questionnaire was distributed to a total of 1138 students in Bağlar (348), Kayapınar (333), Yenişehir (256), and Sur (175) districts. At the end of the investigations, 1112 questionnaires were evaluated. The personal characteristics of the students participating in the study are given in Table 1.

According to Table 1, relatively similar numbers of students from low-, middle-, and high-level schools in terms of socioeconomic background and gender participated in the research; the mother's and father's educational levels are at the primary and secondary school levels; the mothers do not work; the fathers' profession is self-employed and worker; and the number of siblings is concentrated in the range of 3–6.

In the qualitative dimension of the study, criterion sampling, one of the purposive sampling methods, was used. Twenty-one teachers working in schools with different socioeconomic status, who taught social studies courses in the fifth, sixth, and seventh grades and with at least 5 years of teaching experience, participated in the research. Nine of these teachers are female and 12 are male, their professional experience ranges from 9 to 36 years, and their ages vary between 31 years and 51 years. Moreover, eight of the teachers work in schools where students are from low socioeconomic status, six of them are from middle socioeconomic status, and seven of them are from the high socioeconomic status.

Data Collection and Analysis

"Personal Information Form" and "The Questionnaire for the Secondary School Students' Use of Social Studies Course Citizenship Achievements in Their Daily Lives" were used to collect quantitative data of the study, and the qualitative data were collected with the "Teacher Semi-Structured Interview Form." Questions on the gender of the students, level of education, profession of the parents, and the number of siblings were all included in the personal information form. The questionnaire used in the research was developed by the researcher. The process of developing the questionnaire started with identifying the achievements related to citizenship in the social studies curriculum

Table 1.
Personal Characteristics of the Students in the Research Sample

Characteristics		*f*	%
Socioeconomic status of the school	Low	365	32.8
	Middle	378	34.0
	High	369	33.2
Gender	Female	575	51.7
	Male	537	48.3
Mother's education level	Illiterate	347	31.2
	Literate	160	14.4
	Primary school graduate	309	27.8
	Secondary school graduate	152	13.7
	High school graduate	90	8.1
	University graduate	47	4.2
	Has a graduate degree	7	0.6
Father's education level	Illiterate	68	6.2
	Literate	101	9.3
	Primary school graduate	327	30.0
	Secondary school graduate	223	20.5
	High school graduate	230	21.1
	University graduate	117	10.7
	Has a graduate degree	24	2.2
Mother's profession	Does not work	1033	92.9
	Self-employed	17	1.5
	Worker	6	0.6
	Officer	56	5.0
Father's profession	Does not work	137	12.7
	Self-employed	562	51.9
	Worker	208	19.2
	Officer	176	16.3
Number of siblings	1–2	114	10.2
	3–4	529	47.6
	5–6	320	28.8
	7+	149	13.4

for the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades and an item pool was created; then draft questionnaire items were created by taking the opinions of the experts in the field of social studies education. The draft form was finalized by taking the opinions of the social studies teachers and after conducting a pilot study with 32 students. The questionnaire was prepared in a five-point Likert format with 45 items.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences 22.0 package program was used to analyze the quantitative data of the study. In this context, first, the frequencies and percentages of the responses given to the questionnaire items were calculated. In order to determine the relationship between questionnaire items and independent variables, the chi-square test was used. In the study, if the number of categories with the expected value less than five as a result of the first analysis exceeds 20% of the total number of categories, a combination process was made between the categories and the analysis was repeated using the obtained categories (Büyüköztürk, 2002). The level of significance in the analyses was accepted as .05. Moreover, the effect value (Cramer's *V*) was calculated for the items that were associated. Effect size was interpreted by considering the conventions mentioned by Rea & Parker (1992) as follows: 0.00–0.10=negligible association, 0.10–0.20=weak association, 0.20–0.40=moderate association, 0.40–.60=relatively strong association, 0.60–0.80=strong association, and 0.80–1.00=very strong association.

A semi-structured interview form prepared by the researchers was used in the qualitative part of the study. Three experts were given a draft interview form to review, and a pilot study was conducted with five social studies teachers. In the interview, in order to find out how students use citizenship achievements they acquired in Social Studies Course in their daily lives, the teachers were asked the following questions: (i) what are the characteristics that a citizen should have, (ii) what do the students learn in the social studies course in order to be a citizen? (iii) how do students use the citizenship knowledge, skills, and values they learned in the social studies course in their daily lives? (family, classroom, school, and environment), (iv) what kind of problems do your students encounter while putting the citizenship knowledge, skills, and values they learned in the social studies course into practice in their daily lives? and (v) What can be done to encourage students to use the achievements they have learned in the social studies course more to their daily lives? What suggestions do you have? The interviews were recorded with a voice recorder.

The data were analyzed using the content analysis method. The basic process is to combine related data under certain concepts and themes and organize them in a way that is understandable to the reader (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). During the qualitative analysis process, sub-codes were derived from participant responses. The interviews were coded by both the researcher and the field expert, and the reliability average of the comparisons made was calculated as 93.3%. In addition, the participants' names were kept confidential by using a code name instead of their real names.

During the research process, an ethics committee certificate was received from the Anadolu University Social and Human Sciences Research and Publication Ethics Committee with the decision number 66858. Additionally, research permission was granted by the Diyarbakır Provincial Directorate of National Education. The consent form was signed, and participants' consent was obtained during the research process.

Results

Students' Views on Their Use of Social Studies Course Citizenship Achievements in Daily Life

The views of secondary school students on the use of citizenship achievements in social studies course in daily life are presented in Table 2.

As seen in Table 2, students agree with most of the items made on how they practice citizenship in their daily lives by more than 60%. In other words, it can be said that the students displayed most of the citizenship behaviors in the questionnaire. On the other hand, the items with the highest agreement rates (nearly 90%), the behaviors that students believe they engage in the most, include not damaging the historical places around them (89.4%), giving seat to pregnant, elderly, and disabled people in public transportation vehicles (88.7%), visiting elders in Bayram holidays (88%), and doing their homework (87.2%). These items are followed by standing in silent homage when the national anthem is sung (82.5%), not damaging the property at school (82.4%), objecting when their rights are violated (81%), and objecting to the sharing of personal information without their permission (80.2%). Participating in non-governmental organization (NGO) activities on a voluntary basis (26.9%) and taking part in student club activities at school (39.6%) are the behaviors that the students think they do the least.

In addition, regarding the behaviours that less than half of the students agree include participating in charity work in their neighborhoods (44.4%), considering the recyclability of the products they buy (44.6%), sharing their views on any topic on social media (46.1%), participating in official holiday celebrations at school (47.5%), and supporting a campaign initiated by friends to solve a problem at school (49.2%). Once more, in the questionnaire items which were negatively structured and less than half of the students did not agree , expressing

Table 2.
Students' Views on Citizenship Practices in Their Daily Lives

Items		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I participate in student club activities at school.	*f*	136	275	260	309	132
	%	12.2	24.7	23.4	27.8	11.8
2. I tidy up my bed.	*f*	133	131	141	354	353
	%	12.9	11.8	12.7	31.8	31.7
3. As a child, I do not allow myself to do things for which I am not responsible.	*f*	165	107	180	281	379
	%	14.8	9.6	16.2	25.3	34.1
4. I do my homework.	*f*	33	34	75	269	701
	%	3	3.1	6.7	24.2	63
5. When someone hurts me, I don't tell anyone.*	*f*	608	180	160	86	78
	%	54.7	16.2	14.4	7.7	7
6. I search for the truth of an opinion.	*f*	106	97	275	348	286
	%	9.5	8.7	24.7	31.3	25.7
7. When my rights are violated, I object.	*f*	76	41	95	310	590
	%	6.8	3.7	8.5	27.9	53.1
8. I don't damage property at school.	*f*	60	45	90	306	611
	%	5.4	4	8.1	27.5	54.9
9. I reflect carefully about an event in my life.	*f*	71	65	197	372	407
	%	6.4	5.8	17.7	33.5	36.6
10. I don't talk to my friends who don't think like me.*	*f*	503	241	195	77	96
	%	45.2	21.7	17.5	6.9	8.6
11. I visit our elders on holidays.	*f*	37	33	53	233	756
	%	3.3	3	4.8	21	68
12. When my friend doesn't want to play, I don't force him/her.	*f*	121	97	166	326	402
	%	10.9	8.7	14.9	29.3	36.2
13. When I believe my teacher won't agree with me, I keep my opinions to myself.*	*f*	364	164	241	167	176
	%	32.7	14.7	21.7	15	15.8
14. I give seat to pregnant, elderly, and disabled people in public transport.	*f*	49	20	52	227	764
	%	4.4	1.8	4.7	20.4	68.7
15. I do not harm the historical places around me.	*f*	35	29	54	227	767
	%	3.1	2.6	4.9	20.4	69
16. When I come across a different culture, I search for the characteristics of that culture.	*f*	98	106	263	329	316
	%	8.8	9.5	23.7	29.6	28.4
17. I don't make friends with people who are not like me.*	*f*	324	175	274	165	174
	%	29.1	15.7	24.6	14.8	15.6
18. When buying things, I give priority to my wants.*	*f*	219	168	299	233	193
	%	19.7	15.1	26.9	21	17.4
19. I budget my spending considering my pocket money.	*f*	86	49	148	304	525
	%	7.7	4.4	11.2	27.3	47.2
20. I cannot return a product even if it is defective.*	*f*	630	185	136	63	98
	%	56.7	16.6	12.2	5.7	8.8
21. I never purchase durable consumer goods without a warranty certificate and user manual.	*f*	128	100	211	214	459
	%	11.5	9	19	19.2	41.3
22. I use my unused items in different ways to meet my needs.	*f*	107	99	237	309	360
	%	9.6	8.9	21.3	27.8	32.4
23. I get hesitant to ask for the invoice of the products I purchased.*	*f*	566	202	148	96	100
	%	50.9	18.2	13.3	8.6	9
24. I use water carefully when brushing my teeth.	*f*	71	60	114	280	587
	%	6.4	5.4	10.3	25.2	52.8
25. I make sure that the products I buy are recyclable.	*f*	161	135	320	228	268
	%	14.5	12.1	28.8	20.5	24.1
26. I do not behave disrespectfully on the Internet.	*f*	121	46	114	246	585
	%	10.9	4.1	10.3	22.1	52.6
27. I use the waste collection boxes around me.	*f*	131	96	236	310	339
	%	11.8	8.6	21.2	27.9	30.5
28. I object to others imposing their opinions on me.	*f*	3.57	100	207	212	351
	%	21.8	9	18.6	19.1	31.6
29. When I see a crime committed, I don't tell anyone.*	*f*	560	160	192	81	119
	%	50.7	14.4	17.3	7.3	10.7
30. I participate in charity work in our neighborhood.	*f*	195	154	270	252	241
	%	17.5	13.8	24.3	22.7	21.7

Table 2.
Students' Views on Citizenship Practices in Their Daily Lives (Continued)

Items		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
31. I obey the traffic rules.	*f*	85	43	117	295	572
	%	7.6	3.9	10.5	26.5	51.4
32. I voluntarily participate in the work of non-governmental organizations.	*f*	278	224	310	175	125
	%	25	20.1	27.9	15.7	11.2
33. I attend the official holiday celebrations held at school.	*f*	171	152	261	277	251
	%	15.4	13.7	23.5	24.9	22.6
34. I buy the products I want (books, music, and movies) even if they are illegal versions.*	*f*	359	144	222	189	198
	%	32.3	12.9	20	17	17.8
35. I pay homage when the national anthem is sung.	*f*	52	41	107	261	651
	%	4.7	3.7	9.6	23.5	58.5
36. I make an effort to speak Turkish elegantly and correctly.	*f*	51	57	156	327	521
	%	4.6	5.1	14	29.4	46.9
37. I react when my friends are discriminated against.	*f*	63	51	200	273	525
	%	5.7	4.6	18	24.6	47.2
38. I obey the school rules.	*f*	39	39	146	334	554
	%	3.5	3.5	13.1	30	49.8
39. I object to the sharing of my private information (picture and phone number) without my permission.	*f*	72	50	98	174	718
	%	6.5	4.5	8.8	15.6	64.6
40. I hesitate to report a problem I have at school to the school administration.*	*f*	462	181	212	131	126
	%	41.5	16.3	19.1	11.8	11.3
41. I participate in a campaign initiated by my friends to solve a problem at school.	*f*	131	120	314	268	279
	%	11.8	10.8	28.2	24.1	25.1
42. I object to the election of class presidents that are not held fairly.	*f*	140	97	225	254	396
	%	12.6	8.7	20.2	22.8	35.6
43. If my family makes a decision about me that I don't agree with, I want to change it.	*f*	127	84	198	310	393
	%	11.4	7.6	17.8	27.9	35.3
44. I express my views on any subject on social media (Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram).	*f*	263	113	223	230	283
	%	23.7	10.2	20.1	20.7	25.4
45. I do not pay attention to the sources I use while preparing my research paper.*	*f*	554	172	153	101	132
	%	49.8	15.5	13.8	9.1	11.9

*The items asked in the questionnaire reversely.

their opinion when they thought that their teacher would not agree with their opinion (44.4%), making friends with people who were not like them (44.8%), and not buying illegal versions of products (% 45.2) can also be considered as citizenship behaviors that students exhibit less than others. These items with less agreement also draw attention due to their notable indecision rates. Other items that stand out due to their indecision rates are searching for the reality of an opinion (24.7%), making friends with people who are not like them (24.6%), learning about the characteristics of that culture when encountering a different culture (23.7%), and consuming their unused items in different ways to meet their needs (21.3%), and using waste collection boxes in the neighborhood (21.2%).

Variables Affecting Students' Use of Social Studies Course Citizenship Achievements in Daily Life

According to the study, it is seen that the socioeconomic status, parents' education level, parents' profession, and the number of siblings all have an impact on how the students use citizenship achievements they learn in the social studies course in daily lives. The findings with reference to the socioeconomic status variable are presented in Table 3.

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that there is a relationship between some citizenship behaviors of students and their socioeconomic status characteristics. Although it is "negligible" according to the Cramer's *V* value, students from a high socioeconomic status show more participation in the following items compared to students from the middle and low socioeconomic status; in other words, they think that they exhibit these behaviors in daily life more: refusing to do things for which they were not responsible as children (M3), objecting when their rights are violated (M7), making friends with people who are not like them (M17), resisting others' imposition of their thoughts on them (M8), trying to change a decision taken by their family about them when they don't want it (M43), sharing their views on any subject on social media (M44), and reacting when discriminated

Table 3.
Chi-Square Test Results for Socioeconomic Status Variable

Item	x^2	*p*	Cramer's *V*	SD
3	18.490	.018	0.129	8
5	37.769	.000	0.130	8
7	19.581	.012	0.094	8
14	20.087	.010	0.095	8
17	17.334	.027	0.088	8
18	17.766	.023	0.089	8
23	23.355	.003	0.102	8
25	29.980	.000	0.116	8
27	15.534	.050	0.084	8
28	18.134	.020	0.090	8
29	31.481	.000	0.119	8
34	15.638	.048	0.084	8
37	21.841	.005	0.099	8
38	24.421	.002	0.105	8
39	37.186	.000	0.129	8
41	15.724	.047	0.084	8
43	20.431	.009	0.096	8
44	19.553	.012	0.094	8

Note: SD = standard deviation.

against by their friends (M37). For instance, the rate of participation in the high socioeconomic status (56%) for the item "I object to others imposing their opinions on me" [x^2 (SD = 8, n = 1112) = 18.134, p < .05], which is significantly different according to the socioeconomic status, decreased toward middle (47.5%) and low socioeconomic status (47.4%). Similarly, in favor of students from the high socioeconomic status, there is a significant difference in the "weak association" in the rates of agreementin the following items according to the Cramer's V value: do not tell others when someone harms them (M5), do not hesitate to ask for the invoice of the products they purchase (M23), do not tell anyone when they see a crime committed (M29), stand in silence when the national anthem is sung (M35), obey the school rules (M38), and object to the sharing of personal information without their consent (M39). In other words, it is reasonable to think that these citizenship behaviors in daily life are demonstrated more by students at the high-socioeconomic status. For instance, a significant difference was found [x^2 (SD = 8, n = 1112) = 23.355, p < .05] for the item "I get hesitant to ask for the invoice of the products I purchased"—the percentage of students from the high socioeconomic status (74.8%) who do not agree with the item is significantly higher than those from the middle (70.7%) and low (61.6%) socioeconomic status. Similarly, agreement rates are in the form of students from the low (20.6%), middle (18.3%), and high socioeconomic (14.1%) status. In Table 4, there are significant differences in favor of students in a "negligible" low socioeconomic status in some items. As an illustration, the questionnaire item "I give seat to pregnant, elderly, and disabled people in public transport" for which a significant difference was found [x^2 (SD = 8, n = 1112) = 20.087, p < .05], it is striking that the agreement rates decreased from the low (90.7%) socioeconomic status toward the middle (89.1%) and high (87.3%) socioeconomic status, while the non-participation rates increased. This suggests that students from low socioeconomic status are more likely to give seats to pregnant, elderly, and disabled people in public transportation. Similarly, in other items, it can be said that the students in the low socioeconomic status show the behaviors of paying attention to the recyclability of the products they buy in daily life (M25), giving priority to their needs when purchasing products (M18), and buying less illegal version products (M34). Finally, it was found that in comparison to students from the low and high socioeconomic status, those from the middle socioeconomic status were more likely to agreement the item (M41) to participate in the campaign initiated by friends to solve a problem at school with a "negligible level" association.

The study also examined the students' responses in terms of the education level of their parents. The categories of university graduate and postgraduate graduate, however, were combined as university graduate (associate degree, undergraduate, and graduate) because the conditions for performing the chi-square test could not be met in the distribution of some answers into categories during the analysis. On the other hand, the calculation was not possible since the number of categories with expected values less than five exceeded 20% of the total number of categories in M11, M14, and M15 for the mother's education level and in M11 and M15 for the father's education level. The findings are presented in Table 4.

Table 4.
Chi-Square Test Results for Mother and Father Education Variables

Mother's Education Level					**Father's Education Level**				
Item	x^2	p	Cramer's V	SD	Item	x^2	p	Cramer's V	SD
1	42.390	.002	0.098	20	3	32.841	.035	0.087	20
20	40.647	.004	0.096	20	12	31.709	.046	0.085	20
23	41.311	.003	0.096	20	23	57.689	.000	0.115	20
28	50.458	.000	0.107	20	28	38.801	.007	0.094	20
33	47.757	.000	0.104	20	32	37.031	.012	0.092	20
39	38.258	.008	0.093	20	33	46.278	.001	0.103	20
43	46.948	.001	0.103	20	34	33.838	.027	0.088	20
					35	34.298	.024	0.089	20
					39	36.121	.015	0.091	20
					43	52.235	.000	0.109	20

Note: SD = standard deviation.

According to Table 4, it is seen that there is a significant relationship according to the education level of both mother and father in five items (M23, M28, M33, M39, and M43), the mother's education level in M1 and M20, and the father's education level in five items (M3, M12, M32, M34, and M35). However, these differences are at "negligible" or "weak" levels according to Cramer's V values. In this context, with regard to questionnaire items asking for the invoice of the products they buy without hesitation in terms of education level of both parents (M23), opposing others' imposition of their own thoughts (M28), objecting to the sharing of personal information when they do not have permission (M39), and trying to change a decision made by their families about them when they do not want it (M43), there are significant differences in the rates of agreement in items in favor of students whose mothers or fathers are university graduates. For example, a significant difference was found [x^2 (SD = 20, n = 1112) = 52.235, p < .05] for the item "If my family makes a decision about me that I don't agree with, I want to change it." (M43), the rate of participation in the mother (illiterate: 60%, 3; literate: 61.3%; primary school: 62.8%; secondary school: 64.5%; high school: 70%; university: 83.3% or father's education level (54.2%; 60.3%); 61.4%; 63%; 66%; 77.3%, it increases as it rises. In the rates of those who did not agree, there is a similar change in the opposite direction in both mother's and father's education levels. In other words, it is reasonable to think that the students whose parents have a high level of education demonstrate these citizenship behaviors more frequently than the students who have a mother and father with a lower education level. On the other hand, the rate of agreement in the item (M33: participating in the official holiday celebrations held at school) decreases from lower to higher education levels. In other words, it can be said that students whose parents have a lower education level participate more in the official holiday celebrations held at school than students with parents who have higher education levels.

As can be seen in Table 4, there are significant differences between the rates of participation in student club activities at school (M1) in terms of the mother's education level and returning a defective product (M20) in terms of the father's education level, not allowing themselves to do things for which they are not responsible (M3), not buying illegal version products (M34), and paying homage in silence when the national anthem is sung (M35). These differences between the groups are "negligible" and favor students whose parents have a higher education level. On the other hand, there is a "negligible" significant difference in favor of students whose parents have a lower education level in the rate of their participation in the item not forcing their friends when they do not want to play games (M12). Finally, although there is an uneven distribution in the rates of participation in the activities of NGOs (M32) according to the education level of the father, it was found that the students whose fathers graduated from secondary school and primary school participated more. However, the relationship in question is at a "negligible" level.

The study also investigated the students' responses in terms of mother's and father's profession. However, during the analysis of the mother's profession, the distribution of some of the answers into categories was combined, since the necessary conditions for performing the chi-square test were not met. Categories and frequencies in the first stage were: "Mother doesn't work" (1033), "Self-employed" (17), "Worker" (6), and "Officer" (56). These categories were arranged as "Mother doesn't work (1033)" and "Mother working (79)" for analysis. In addition, since 20% of the responses to M14 had an expected

Table 5.
Chi-Square Test Results for Mother's Profession Variable

Item	x^2	*p*	Cramer's *V*	SD
43	10.270	.036	0.096	4
44	10.219	.037	0.096	4

Note: SD = standard deviation.

frequency of 5 or less, the calculation could not be made. The results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 shows that, although at a "negligible" level, the rate of participation in M43 (75.9 – 62.3%) and M44 (57 – 45.3%) is higher for students whose mothers work than those whose mothers do not. This suggests that students whose mothers work demonstrate more behaviors such as trying to change a decision taken by their parents if they do not want it (M43) and sharing their views on any subject on social media (M44). The results of the chi-square test for the variable related to the father's profession are presented in Table 6.

As can be seen in Table 6, there is a relationship between the responses given to 13 items and father's profession; in other words, the responses vary significantly depending on the father's profession. Accordingly, it is noteworthy that the rate of agreement the behaviors of not harming the things at school (M8), reflecting carefully about an event they experienced (M9), using the waste collection boxes around them (M27), objecting others' imposition of their thoughts on them (M28), paying homage in silence when the national anthem is sung (M35), and not being afraid to report a problem to the school administration (M40) decreased significantly at a "negligible" level in the form of students whose fathers were officers, self-employed, and workers and those whose fathers did not work. As an illustration, participation rates for M27 for which a significant difference was found [x^2 (SD = 112, n = 1112) = 21.204, $p < .05$] are seen to increase in the form of whose father does not work (54.7%), whose father was self-employed (57.2%), whose father is a worker (57.2%), and whose father is an officer (65.3%). Considering the other questionnaire items in which a similar situation is presented, it can be thought that the students whose fathers do not work demonstrate these citizenship behaviors in daily life less than the others and those whose fathers are officers demonstrate more. There is a "weak" and the same significant difference in the behavior of objecting to the sharing of personal information without their consent (M39) and trying to change a decision taken by their families when they do not want them (M43). There is a strikingly lowest level of agreement of students whose fathers are not working (35%) with regard to the item sharing their views on any subject on social media (M44), while those whose fathers are self-employed and officers agree at the highest rates.

When Table 6 is examined, it can be seen that students whose fathers do not work have notably the highest participation rates in behaviors for the items that are related to the father's profession such as talking

Table 6.
Chi-Square Test Results for Father's Profession Variable

Item	x^2	*p*	Cramer's *V*	SD	Item	x^2	*p*	Cramer's *V*	SD
8	22.391	.033	0.083	12	28	24.872	.012	0.087	12
9	22.755	.030	0.084	12	35	21.482	.044	0.081	12
10	23.175	.026	0.084	12	39	35.623	.000	0.105	12
18	23.002	.028	0.084	12	40	25.326	.013	0.088	12
24	21.521	.043	0.081	12	43	34.692	.001	0.103	12
25	21.888	.039	0.082	12	44	21.809	.040	0.082	12
27	21.204	.047	0.081	12					

Note: SD = standard deviation.

Table 7.
Chi-Square Test Results for the Number of Siblings Variable

Item	x^2	*p*	Cramer's *V*	SD	Item	x^2	*p*	Cramer's *V*	SD
5	28.865	.004	0.093	12	10	30.634	.002	0.096	12
7	23.612	.023	0.084	12	41	22.286	.034	0.082	12

Note: SD = standard deviation.

to friends who do not share their opinions (M10), paying attention to the recyclability of the products I purchase (M25), prioritizing their needs over their wishes when purchasing products (M18), and using water carefully when brushing their teeth (M24). In light of this, it can be thought that students whose fathers do not work demonstrate these citizenship behaviors more frequently in daily life. However, according to Cramer's *V* values, the relationship of these items with the father's profession is at a "negligible" level.

As shown in Table 7, there is a significant relationship between the responses given to the four items and the variable of the number of siblings. Although it was at a "negligible" level, it was found that participation increased in the items of telling others when someone hurt them (M5) and objecting when their rights were violated (M7) as the number of siblings decreased. For instance, the rate of participation in M7 for which it was determined that there was a significant difference between the views [x^2 (SD = 12, n = 1112) = 23.612, $p < .05$] was 83.9% for those with 1–2 siblings; 83.4% for those with 3–4; 80.6% for those with 5–6; and 74.5% for those with 7 and above. Similarly, the rate of non-participants decreases in parallel with the number of siblings (14.8%, 10.3%, 10.3%, and 6.3%, respectively). In other words, it can be assumed that people with many siblings demonstrate these behaviors less. On the other hand, in favor of students with many siblings, there is a significant difference in the agreement-rates for the items talking to friends who think differently from them (M10) and participating in the campaigns initiated by their friends to solve a problem at school (M41) although at a "negligible" level. For instance, the rate of non-participation for the item "I do not talk to my friends who do not think like me" [x^2 (SD = 112, n = 1112) = 30.634, $p < .05$] decreases toward those who have less than seven siblings (71.6%, 67%, 64.7%, and 64.5%, respectively). The rate of agreements, on the other hand, increases (11.3%, 11.7%, 14.4%, and 23.5%, respectively). Therefore, it can be assumed that students with a large number of siblings talk more with their friends who hold differing viewpoints to theirs.

Views of Social Studies Teachers on Citizenship Practices in Students' Daily Lives

Teachers' evaluations of citizenship education practices in social studies classes and how students will use citizenship achievements in their daily lives are influenced by their own perception of citizenship. For this reason, teachers were initially asked about the characteristics that a citizen should have. Teachers emphasized that citizens should be individuals who are "aware of their rights, apply them to their daily lives, and respect the rights of others." Then, the majority of the teachers stated that they should be individuals who "know and fulfill their responsibilities." Some teachers emphasized the characteristics of "feeling a sense of belonging to the country they live in," "doing everything they can to protect their country," "feeling sensitive to the problems around them and intervening to solve the problem," and "having values such as honesty, justice, equality, respect, and tolerance."

The teachers stated that students learned their rights and the rules of society, institutions and duties, administrative units, NGOs, and current issues in the social studies course. Most of the teachers said that they gave information on this subject with simple language. The teachers

stated that they mostly covered fundamental individual rights in the social studies lesson. Following is an explanation made by one of these teachers:

> First and foremost, starting with the right to live, which we refer to as one of our fundamental rights, we say that they have the right to get education, health services, the right to live in a healthy environment, the right to be elected, the other people have these rights as well as them. We also teach them that if there is a situation regarding human rights that cannot be handled within the country, they can go as far as the European Court of Human Rights.

Some of the teachers said that they made an effort to help students gain citizenship skills such as political literacy, communication skills, participation and technology literacy, research, and self-knowledge skills. However, the teachers said that they tried to teach these skills to the students more theoretically and they did not engage them in any activities. However, the citizenship value that teachers try hardest to instill in their students is responsibility. The values of being sensitive to problems, working for one's country, respecting others' rights, contributing to society, loving one's home country, and feeling a sense of belonging come after responsibility.

As stated by the teachers, the subjects covered in social studies classes that students are most interested in are those that they encounter and use in their daily lives, such as voting and being elected, human rights and democracy, science and technology, and communication. Along with these, the teachers stated that the students showed interest in the subjects that were presented in concrete terms, those that were asked in the exams, and those that made use of visual materials. According to the teachers, the students were not interested in subjects such as history, administrative units, political rights, taxes, and laws related to citizenship in the social studies course. Teachers said that this was because these subjects were memorized, were abstract, were not applicable to daily life, were theoretical, were not suitable for the student level, and did not have real-world applications in the society.

The majority of the teachers stated that, based on their observations, they theoretically understood what the students learned in the lesson, but few had actually put it into practice in their lives. Teachers stated that the applications of citizenship achievements learned in social studies course in students' lives vary depending on the student, family, school, and environment. The teachers said that the students who come from family and environment with a better socioeconomic and cultural level can use their citizenship knowledge more in daily life. For instance, a teacher shared his views on this matter by saying, "Whether or not to put in to practice what you have learned depends on the person. Of course, it changes depending on the family, environment, school and virtual environments."

Teachers noted that students mostly seek their rights, use consumer and petition rights, empathize, and shop safely in their daily lives. A teacher stated that his students used their rights with the following words: "They say we have our rights when something happens. When his teachers chose the class president, they said that the class president should be elected. This is our right, they said." Additionally, some teachers also stated that the students are cooperative, sensitive, and use recycled products.

Despite the fact that the teachers emphasized responsibility a lot in their classes, they stated that they could not observe this in the daily lives of the students. Except for this, teachers said that students do not protect nature, school, and their belongings, as well as being caring, being egalitarian, sharing, and not discriminating enough in their daily lives. Additionally, teachers think that students do not consistently apply solving problems peacefully, establishing positive communication and human relations, and following the rules of the school and the classroom in their daily lives. For instance, a teacher drew attention to communication problems by saying, "When children have a problem with each other, they try to solve it by fighting rather than by talking."

Teachers report that while students are using the knowledge, skills, and values that they have learned in the social studies course in their daily lives, students encounter problems brought on by the school and education system, environment, family, students, and teachers. It was stated that there are problems due to the school and education system such as inadequacies in the social studies program and textbooks, conflicts between what is taught in the classroom and real life, a lack of importance placed on the social studies course, lack of practice opportunities at school, and the distance from the school.

At the very top of the environmental problems, we can mention the following: students' social context that limits their ability to exercise their rights, the people around them set bad examples for students, and the people do not care about students' ideas. In addition to these, other opinions include the way in which the students respond to the mistakes they made, the lack of equality in the society, and the disregard for the rules existing in the society. A teacher explained the dilemma of the students by saying that "when student notices that people around them do not behave in the same way as him, the child becomes upset and eventually starts to behave differently." Additionally, the following is how a teacher further explained how much more the students were influenced by what they saw in their surroundings and many of the knowledge they learned in the school did not come to life:

> The disparity between what the children are learning in class and what they observe in their families and later environments causes a lot of distress. Our neighborhood … a place where the river flows. This is a special place with endemic species. Unfortunately, there are individuals who overfish and pollute the water and nature. The child both sees these and often participates in these activities. In other words, we talk about protecting nature in the classroom, but it is not actually practiced.

The teachers contend that issues like the family's low level of education, their financial situation, parents' lack of interest in the students, the cultural context, and the lessons being taught in the course are not in the same direction, and the fact that the family does not respond to the student's inappropriate behavior are all familial factors that prevent students from using their citizenship achievements in daily life. A teacher explained that in some families, children could not use their rights by saying, "Many students say that you have the right to speak and express your ideas, but they do not even allow us to choose our own clothes." Another teacher expressed his views by saying, "We encourage students to voice their opinions when a decision is made in the class. When the child expressed their opinion on a subject, people around him said they were not going to ask him what he thought." Along with these, the teachers stated that "Indifferent parental attitudes make the children more aggressive and irresponsible." In addition to these, the teachers stated that they experienced problems arising from the students not being able to internalize what is taught in the lesson, using violence, being in a moral degradation, and being shy and spoiled.

Some teachers criticize themselves and their colleagues for citizenship education, pointing out that they are not good role models, they lack information on citizenship-related issues, and they are unable to express some issues in the classroom. Some teachers claimed that what some of their colleagues taught in class and what they practiced in the classroom and at school were in conflict. A teacher explained

as, "What we talk about and practices can differ from each other. For instance, school representatives are not chosen by students. The teacher appoints the class president. There is a contrast between what the child has learned and the situations he has lived through in his mind."

The teachers' suggestions for the curriculum include increasing the number of hours and rearranging the curriculum's content to enable students to use the citizenship knowledge, skills, and values they learned in the social studies course more frequently in their daily lives. Additionally, suggestions have been made to improve the functionality of school clubs more, to increase and support in-school and out-of-school activities, to place more emphasis on value education, to allow for more active participation, to use various methods in assessment and evaluation, to cooperate with NGOs, and to provide students with technology literacy skills. Some teachers also recommend enriching the materials and rewarding students for using what they have learned in the lesson. Reduced class sizes, the elimination of dual education, simplified educational policies, more elective courses, and offering citizenship education as a separate course have all been proposed for the education system. Besides these, other ideas included setting up of the class progression system, cutting back on compulsory course hours, valuing teachers, and providing students with job opportunities in the field where they were educated after school. Regarding families, it was suggested to establish family–school cooperation, educating families and assisting them financially; regarding the environment, suggestions were made to the students that the society should set a positive example. Regarding teachers, giving in-service training, attracting students' attention to the lesson, using technology in the lesson, getting to know the students well, making the seminar periods more productive, and valuing the ideas of the students were stated as suggestions. Regarding the textbooks, suggestions were made to simplify the subjects, give more space to the visuals, and provide the students with helpful source books.

Discussion and Conclusion and Recommendations

The research revealed that the students participated in the study used the majority of the citizenship achievements they learned in the social studies course in their daily lives—in their home life, school life, and social environment and in their relations with the economic and natural environment. However, it is seen that students are undecided about taking part in social participation activities inside and outside the school, expressing their opinions, and respecting different opinions. Moreover, among the notable findings, the students noted that they did not pay attention to the fact that they purchased illegal versions of the products and that the products they purchased were recyclable. As for teachers, they thought that students did not apply protecting the environment, protecting school property, being considerate, egalitarian, sharing, and not discriminating, resolving conflicts amicably, communicating positively, adhering to school and classroom rules, and particularly carrying out their responsibilities and being respectful. The research findings of this study support each other in that the students' indecisive attitude toward adequate participation in and outside the school, and the teachers' failure to address students' participation competencies in daily life. Additionally, it can be said that the participation competencies of the students are not sufficiently developed in the social studies course, as teachers generally provide information-oriented traditional education in their classes and that they include social and political participation theoretically like other subjects. This situation demonstrates that teachers' and students' ideas of active citizenship engagement have not yet fully matured and do not represent real-world experiences. Many research results also support these findings (Ersoy, 2007; Eryılmaz et al., 2018, Kuş & Aksu, 2017; Memişoğlu, 2014).

The research findings indicate that students' citizenship behaviors in daily life vary depending on their socioeconomic environment. It is seen that the students from the high socioeconomic environment speak their minds more freely both in their daily lives and in the social media compared to the other students, while they are more comfortable in exercising their rights and they also react more to violations of rights. Additionally, it is evident that these students are more against discrimination and adhere to a respectful and tolerant attitude. Moreover, it is found that the students from the low and middle socioeconomic status generally follow the social norms, as they give seats to the pregnant, elderly, and disabled people while using public transport rather than following rules. In the interview, teachers also highlighted the socioeconomic status and stated that students can use their rights in accordance with the environment they live in. As stated by the teachers, the main problems arising from the socioeconomic and cultural environment of students' use of the citizenship achievements in the course in their lives are the restriction of students' use of their rights, the existence of negative examples, their disregard for their ideas, their reaction to their mistakes, the lack of equality, and the failure of others to follow the rules. These findings are in line with the previous research findings in the literature showing that the environment has a significant impact on shaping students' democracy, citizenship, and value perceptions (Davies et al., 1999; Doğanay & Sarı, 2004; Göğebakan, 2011). As the socioeconomic standing of the family, particularly its income and degree of education, increases, the citizenship competencies of the youth also increase (Kim & Chung, 2020; Shah et al., 2009). Students with high socioeconomic income and education level develop effective relationship with their higher self and environment. However, the number of books read at home and the democratic education methods used in the classroom increase the citizenship competencies of students from low socioeconomic levels (Kim & Chung, 2020). Therefore, the family's socioeconomic standing, the political socialization process in the family, and the opportunities and resources that the family provides to their children in this process all play a significant role. Davies (1965) attributes the role of the family in the development of the child's political consciousness to meeting his basic physical and emotional needs. According to Davies, addressing these needs helps the child's transition from dependency to autonomy and to become a mature and responsible citizen in the future. Otherwise, a chronic dependency model, including political consciousness, may emerge when children experience physical and emotional deprivation in the family. Children who struggle to strike a balance between their own needs and family happiness can only gradually develop from hierarchical to egalitarian citizenship if they are raised in environments with egalitarian citizens who can share power responsibly in the future.

The research also yielded findings on how the family structure had an impact on the application of the student citizenship achievements. It has been observed that the parents' education level and profession affect the citizenship behaviors of the students in their daily lives. According to the findings of the study, the students are better able to participate in family decisions, schoolwork, and social life, and they can speak their minds without fear if their mother has a higher education level. The daily citizenship behaviors of the students are likewise influenced by the employment status of their mothers. It has been found that students whose mothers are working are more likely to try to change a decision made by their families when they do not want to and express their opinions on any subject on social media. This finding demonstrates that students with working mothers are better at expressing their views both within and outside the family than those whose mothers are not working. However, students whose fathers have university degrees stated that they participate in student club activities more frequently than other students and that their parents do not allow them to do work for which they are not responsible. It has been observed that the profession of the father, like the mother, also has an impact on some daily citizenship

behaviors of the students. Similar to this, there are times when students' daily citizenship behaviors are influenced by the father's profession. For instance, students whose fathers are officers do not harm the school property more than other students, talk to their friends who hold different opinions, use the waste collection boxes around them, oppose others' imposing their thoughts on them, do not hesitate to report a problem they have at school to the school administration, and object to the sharing of their personal information without their permission. It has been seen that they try to change a decision taken by their families about them when they do not want them. Moreover, students whose fathers are self-employed voice their opinions on any subject on social media more than students whose fathers do not work and who work as workers or officers. Additionally, it has been found that students whose fathers do not work prioritize their needs over their wants when buying more products than others, use water carefully while brushing their teeth, and pay attention to the recyclability of the products they purchase. In these findings, for instance, it is found that fathers who do not work have an impact on their children being more frugal in economic matters and being conscious consumers. This demonstrates that the characteristics of the father's profession have an impact on the daily citizenship behaviors of students. In the literature, different research results have also revealed that students' perception of democracy and their attitudes toward democracy are related to their father's education level (Akan, 2011; Gömleksiz & Kan, 2008). In general, there are studies showing that the parents' educational levels affect the attitudes of students toward democracy and citizenship (Doğanay, 2010; Gömleksiz & Kan, 2008; Özbek, 2004).

Another finding of the study is that some daily citizenship behaviors of the students are influenced by the number of siblings. It was observed that students with fewer siblings told others when someone hurt them more than others and objected when their rights were violated. In this regard, it can be concluded that students who have fewer siblings defend their rights and freedoms more. Moreover, it can be said that the students who have 7 or more siblings exhibit a high level of respect for diversity and participation aspects in their daily lives. There are research results that support (Gömleksiz & Çetintaş; 2011) and do not support (Yaşar-Ekici, 2014) this finding of the study.

The scope of this study was limited to the schools located in the city center of Diyarbakir and the views of students and teachers. According to the findings of this study, it is recommended that citizenship-related subjects in the social studies curriculum should be connected to the daily lives of students and taught using activities that students can complete in their daily lives. Thus, it can be ensured that education is internalized by experiencing it in students' lives. Moreover, in order to enable students to use their effective citizenship competences more frequently in their daily lives and take the necessary precautions, teachers should know their students and the social context in which they live in well. Moreover, in-class and extracurricular activities should be carried out that will help students use their citizenship achievements from the social studies course in their daily lives. In order for students to use their citizenship achievements in daily life, teachers can cooperate with other teachers and administration inside the school, primarily with the family and other official and social institutions outside the school. Since the socioeconomic level is one of the key elements influencing the daily behavior of students, quantitative and qualitative studies can be conducted on diverse family structures and various social cultural groups that differ according to their socioeconomic levels.

Ethics Committee Approval: Ethics committee approval was received for this study from the ethics committee of Anadolu University (Date: June 11, 2018, Number: 66858).

Informed Consent: Written informed consent was obtained from all participants who participated in this study.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Author Contributions: Concept – Z. İ., A. F. E.; Design – Z. İ., A. F. E.; Supervision – A. F. E.; Resources – Z. İ., A. F. E.; Materials – Z. İ., A. F. E.; Data Collection and/or Processing – Z. İ.; Analysis and/or Interpretation – Z. İ., A. F. E.; Literature Search – Z. İ., A. F. E.; Writing Manuscript – A. F. E.; Critical Review – A. F. E.; Other – Z. İ., A. F. E.

Declaration of Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interest.

Funding: The authors declared that this study has recived no financial support.

References

Akan, Y. (2011). *Ortaöğretimde okuyan öğrencilerin demokrasi bilinci (Sakarya İli Örneği)* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Alkan, T. (1998). *Siyasal bilinç ve toplumsal değişim*. Gündoğan Yayınları, Pegem Akademi.

Baştürk, N. (2011). *İlköğretim 8. sınıf vatandaşlık ve demokrasi eğitimi dersi öğretim programı kazanımlarının öğrenci görüşlerine göre değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Beck, P. A., & Jennings, M. K. (1982). Pathways to participation. *American Political Science Review*, *76*(1), 94–108. [CrossRef]

Biesta, G. J. J., Lawy, R. S., & Kelly, N. (2009). Understanding young people's citizenship learning in everyday life: The role of contexts, relationships and dispositions. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, *4*(1), 5–24. [CrossRef]

Boyle Baise, M., & Zevin, J. (2009). *Young citizens of the world: Teaching elementary social studies the rough civic engagement*. Routledge

Brooks, R. M., & Holford, J. A. K. (2009). Citizenship, learning and education: Themes and issues. *Citizenship Studies*, *13*(2), 85–103. [CrossRef]

Brown, C. J. C. (2003). *What do politics have to do with me? Analysis of political alienation among young Canadians*. Paper Presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Sociological Association. Atlanta.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). *Sosyal bilimler İçin veri analizi el kitabı*. Pegem A Yayıncılık.

Clark, A., & Percy-Smith, B. (2006). Beyond consultation: Participatory practices in everyday spaces. *Children, Youth and Environments*, *16*(2), 1–9.

Council of Europe [CoE] (2005). Retrieved from https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/42128013/47261431/2.4.pdf/64ce8034-440c-4ebc-b325-2fe3be0190f5#:~:text=Council%20of%20Europe%202003%20The,opportunity%20and%20where%20necessary%20the.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th edn). Pearson Education.

Davies, J. C. (1965). The family's role in political socialization. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *361*(1), 10–19. [CrossRef]

Davies, I., Gregory, I., & Riley, S. C. (1999). *Good Citizenship and educational provision*. London: Falmer Press.

Doğanay, A. (2010). What does democracy mean to 14-year-old Turkish children? A comparison with results of the 1999 IEA Civic Education Study. *Research Papers in Education*, *25*(1), 51–71. [CrossRef]

Doğanay, A., & Sarı, M. (2004). İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerine temel demokratik değerlerin kazandırılma düzeyi ve bu değerlerin kazandırılması sürecinde açık ve örtük programın etkilerinin karşılaştırılması. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *39*, 356–383.

Ersoy, A. F. (2012). Annelerin vatandaşlık algısı, çocuklarında vatandaşlık bilinci geliştirme uygulamaları ve karşılaştıkları sorunlar. *Kuramdan Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, *12*(3), 2111–2124.

Eryılmaz, Ö., Bursa, S., & Ersoy, A. F. (2018). Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenleri ve Öğrencilerinin Etkin Vatandaşlık ile Sivil Toplum Kuruluşu Algıları. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(2), 258–276.

Göğebakan, Y. (2011). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin kültür varlıklarını tanıma ve sahip çıkma bilinçlerinin oluşmasını belirlemeye yönelik başarı testi ve

tutum ölçeği çalışması. *Adıyaman Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *4*(6), 75–93.

Gömleksiz, M. N., & Bulut, İ. (2006). Yeni sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretim programının uygulamadaki etkililiğinin değerlendirilmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, *47*(47), 393–421.

Gömleksiz, M. N., & Çetintaş, S. (2011). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumları (Fırat, Dicle,7 aralık, cumhuriyet ve Erzincan üniversiteleri örneği). *Dicle Üniversitesi Ziya Gökalp Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *17*, 1–14.

Gömleksiz, M. N., & Kan, A. Ü. (2008). Eğitim fakültesi ve tezsiz yüksek lisans programlarına kayıtlı öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi (Fırat üniversitesi örneği). *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, *178*, 44–63.

Güleç, İ., Çelik, S., & Demirhan, B. (2012). Yaşam boyu öğrenme Nedir? Kavram ve kapsamı üzerine bir değerlendirme. *Sakarya University Journal of Education*, *2*(3), 34–48.

Harris, A., Wyn, J., & Younes, S. (2007). Young people and citizenship: An everyday perspective. *Youth Studies Australia*, *26*(3), 19–27

Harris, A., Wyn, J., & Younes, S. (2010). Beyond apathetic or activist youth 'Ordinary' young people and contemporary forms of participation. *Young*, *18*(1), 9–32. [CrossRef]

Ibrahimoğlu, Z. (2019). Middle school students' conceptual perceptions of the social studies course, and their transfer of the outcomes to daily life. *Journal of Educational Research*, *112*(1), 131–139. [CrossRef]

Kalaycıoğlu, E. (1983). *Karşılaştırmalı siyasal katılma*. İ.Ü.S.B.F. Yayınları.

Kerr, D. (2005). Citizenship education in England–listening to young people: New insights from the citizenship education longitudinal study. *International Journal of Citizenship and Teacher Education*, *1*(1), 74–96.

Kim, H. J., & Chung, J. Y. (2020). Factors affecting youth citizenship in accordance with socioeconomic background. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *111*, (104847). [CrossRef]

Kontaş, H. (2009). *Demokrasi eğitiminde aile ve okulun rolü. I. Uluslararası avrupa birliği, demokrasi, vatandaşlık ve vatandaşlık eğitimi sempozyumu* (ss. 245–249). Uşak Üniversitesi Avrupa Birliği Eğitim Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi Uşak.

Kuş, Z., & Aksu, A. (2017). Vatandaşlık ve vatandaşlık eğitimi hakkında sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin inançları. *Uluslararası Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, *5*(8), 18–41.

Memişoğlu, H. (2014). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin görüşlerine göre vatandaşlık eğitimi. *Journal of Turkish Studies*, *9*(5), 1565–1584. [CrossRef]

Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı [MEB]. (2005). *Sosyal bilgiler 4–5. Sınıf programı*. MEB Yayınları.

National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS] (1994). *Expectations of excellenc: Curriculum standards for the social studies*.

National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS] (2016). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in the social studies. *Social Education*, *80*(3), 180–182.

Özbek, R. (2004). *Vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi ders amaçlarının gerçekleşme düzeyi* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Atatürk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Print, M. (1999). *Strategies for teaching civics and civil society* (M. Print, J. Ellickson-Brown & A. Baginda, Eds.) (ss. 81–98). Civic Education for Civic Society, Asean Academic Press.

Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (1992). *Designing and conducting survey research*. San.

Sabancı, O. (2008). *İlköğretim 7. sınıf öğrencilerinin Sosyal Bilgiler dersinde yer alan vatandaşlık konularıyla ilgili kavramsal anlamaları* (Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Şahin, B. (2009). Metodoloji. İçinde A. Tanrıöğen (Çev.), *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri* (pp. 109–130). Anı Yayıncılık.

Shah, D. V., McLeod, J. M., & Lee, N. J. (2009). Communication competence as a foundation for civic competence: Processes of socialization into citizenship. *Political Communication*, *26*(1), 102–117. [CrossRef]

Smith, N., Lister, R., Middleton, S., & Cox, L. (2005). Young people as real citizens: Towards an inclusionary understanding of citizenship. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *8*(4), 425–443. [CrossRef]

Tonga, D. (2013). *8. sınıf öğrencilerinin vatandaşlık bilinci düzeylerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından değerlendirilmesi* (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Van Deth, J. W. (2013). Citizenship and the civic realities of everyday life in civic education and competences for engaging citizens in democracies. In M. Print & D. Lange (Eds.). *Civic education and competences for engaging citizens in democracies* (pp. 9–23). Sense Publishers.

Verba, S., Burns, N., & Schlozman, K. L. (2003). Unequal at the starting line: Creating participatory inequalities across generations and among groups. *American Sociologist*, *34*(1–2), 45–69. [CrossRef]

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

White, J. (2009). Education and a meaningful life. *Oxford Review of Education*, *35*(4), 423–435. [CrossRef]

Wood, B. E. (2014). Researching the everyday: Young people's experiences and expressions of citizenship. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *27*(2), 214–232. [CrossRef]

Yaşar-Ekici, F. (2014). Öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumları ve demografik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, *9*(11), 593–602.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (8. Baskı). Seçkin Yayıncılık.