

The Use of Fundamental Rights as Active And Responsible Citizens: Tendencies of Social Studies Teacher Candidates

Davut Gürel*

Social Studies Education Department, Faculty of Education, Bartın University, Bartın, Turkey

Corresponding author: Davut Gürel, E-mail: gureldavut@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: November 09, 2021

Accepted: January 25, 2022

Published: January 31, 2022

Volume: 10 Issue: 1

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Ethical statements: Before initiating this research, all necessary permissions have been obtained from the Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee of Bartın University (Protocol No: 2021-SBB-0143).

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to determine the tendencies of social studies teacher candidates, whose primary purpose is to raise active and responsible citizens, towards the use of fundamental rights. The study adopted a survey methodology and reached a total of 356 students studying in the Social Studies Teacher Education undergraduate program at 7 universities in different regions of Turkey. The data collected from these students with a Likert-type survey of ten dimensions, consisting of 48 items and five options, were analyzed using the SPSS 22.0 package program. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics, t-test and ANOVA. The analysis of the collected data showed that the scores obtained from the sub-factors of the survey, access to court and exercising consumer rights, differed significantly in favor of women, and conscious citizenship and taking responsibility differed significantly in favor of men. While none of the scores obtained from all sub-dimensions of the survey differed significantly according to the place of residence of the students, the right to petition, the right to lockout, the right to access court and conscious citizenship and taking responsibility differed according to the undergraduate class level. The overall assessment of the results is that the tendencies towards the exercise of fundamental rights do not differ significantly by students' gender, class level and place of residence, and the overall tendencies in exercising these rights are above average, but not very high.

Key words: Fundamental rights, Active citizen, Responsible citizen, Social studies, Teacher candidates, Seek rights, Legal literacy

INTRODUCTION

The concept of right, a phenomenon closely related to human nature, is "an interest recognized by the legal order, legally protected and empowering the owner of the right to benefit from this protection" in the legal sense (Kayar and Üzülmöz, 2017, p. 333). Law, on the other hand, can be defined as a set of codes of conduct developed by people to maintain the social order and sanctioned by the state in case of violation. Every right that people have today has been achieved as a result of a struggle, and this struggle continues today with the search for new rights. An important part of these rights is the rights that arise from the sole fact that the individual is a human being and are based on the idea that people are equal (Kaçuradi, 2016, p. 44; Tepe, 2014, p. 58). As Schopenhauer (2013) states on the subject, "even if people have different powers, they have equal rights" (p. 32). As expressed in Article 2 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, these are the fundamental rights possessed by every human being regardless of their political opinion, economic status, cultural characteristics, ethnic origin, and gender.

The conceptualization of human rights has a long history (Tepe, 2013, s. 6). First of all, with developing people and societies, protecting human rights has been expressed as the duty of states. From this point of view, a state has two essential duties; to guarantee the fundamental rights of its citizens and to ensure their implementation (Kaçuradi, 2016, p. 43). Rights under the protection of the states began to gain an interstate character in the process, and numerous international treaties secured these rights. This situation has led to the establishment of mechanisms aiming to monitor whether States parties obliged to protect these rights indeed respect these rights or not (Kapani, 1991, p. 33). With these efforts in the international arena and the establishment of supra-state and inter-state institutions, human rights have entered a more protected stage.

Human rights have developed in parallel with the development of humanity. The importance of human rights has never diminished in the historical development of humanity. Despite different forms of governments with distinct approaches to human rights, people have adopted a common understanding of "human rights" over time, especially with the global

acceptance of democratic management. This situation caused acquired rights to be included in the legal doctrine of fundamental rights and freedoms and became a part of international law with the Declaration of Human Rights after the establishment of the United Nations (Çeçen, 2013). With the acceptance of democracy and democratic values in all world societies, sensitivity towards the protection of human rights and awareness of the effective use of these rights have increased even more. In this respect, democracy and human rights can be considered two closely related concepts (Beetham, 2006, p. 138). The most basic principle of democracy is that public affairs can be controlled by the citizens of democratic governments and that citizens are equal in this inspection. This principle requires guaranteeing elections, legislature, civil and political rights (Beetham, 2006, p. 138).

Human rights cover the rights that people have as individuals as well as some rights they have as a group. These rights include guarantees against others, groups, and especially the state (Ertan, 2013). Fundamental rights include civil rights and freedoms such as the right to live, the right to property, the right to a fair trial, and the right to organize assembly and demonstration marches; political rights, such as the right to engage in political activity, the right to access information and the right to petition; social, economic and cultural rights such as the right to strike and lockout, the right to collective bargaining, unionization and consumer rights (Erdoğan et al., 2006). Kaboğlu (2004) states that “...*The rights and freedoms that people have require the legal society as much as the rule of law... A society with a strong sense of solidarity and publicity can overcome the egocentric approach*” (p. 55). Educational institutions have the most crucial role in creating societies where all these rights are effectively used and protected and where solidarity and public awareness are strong enough.

The Social Studies and Fundamental Rights Education

The increasing complexity of modern society necessitates active human life and education to be more closely interrelated (Coady et al., 1950, p. 28). This situation also portrays the responsibility undertaken by educational institutions, which is the most important element of social life that encompasses concrete human rights actions. While it is important to teach theoretical concepts such as values, responsibilities, and rights, especially in the education of citizens in these institutions, it is much more important to support education with practice-based activities (Hablemitoğlu and Özmete, 2012). Similarly, Tepe (2011, pp. 154-156) emphasizes that education on human rights should go beyond teaching relevant national or international legal texts, raise awareness of individuals about protecting their rights and train them on how to do this. Thus, it will be more possible to raise legal literate citizens who are compatible with the society they live in and who meet the requirements of global citizenship in general.

Although fundamental human rights have been achieved through great efforts, it is our responsibility and the responsibility of future generations to protect and further develop these rights. One of the prerequisites for the protection of human rights is a clear understanding of human rights and

what these rights are one by one (Kaçuradi, 2016, p. 8). This assumption clearly demonstrates the importance of educational institutions in this regard. Every state educates its citizens through educational institutions. Educational institutions should first ensure that students discover what the purposes of laws and rules are and are aware of why people should obey these rules. Every student should know that even the most powerful elected or appointed administrators have rules to follow (Zarrillo, 2016, pp. 193-194).

From the past to the present, one of the most basic aims of societies is to raise citizens who will carry their cultural values, are loyal to their state, have adopted the current political system, and are compatible with the expectations of the society in which they live. Bringing such awareness to the citizens to be raised not only ensures the continuity of the country and societies, but also affects the development level of that country by increasing social welfare (Hablemitoğlu and Özmete, 2012). All this information reveals the importance of citizenship education. The most important aim of the social studies course given at the primary education level in Turkey is to raise good citizens. In democratic societies, good citizens mean active citizens and being active requires participation (Zarrillo, 2016, p. 202). The primary education level, where the social studies course is given, is a very critical point of time for the teaching of citizenship rights due to the period the students are experiencing. For this reason, the effective teaching of fundamental human rights within the scope of the course will enable raising qualified citizens of the future.

While listing the objectives of the Social Studies course, the Ministry of National Education (2018) emphasizes its role in raising citizens, especially in articles 1, 14, and 17. These articles state that with the social studies course, students should “*be raised as citizens of the Republic of Turkey, who love their homeland and nation, know and use their rights, fulfill their responsibilities, and have national consciousness*”, “*believe in the importance of participation, express their opinions for the solution of personal and social problems*”, “*show sensitivity to issues that concern their country and the world*” (MEB, 2018, p.8). Similarly, legal literacy is one of the most important skills that social studies class should provide students. All these clearly reveal the role of social studies course in raising active and responsible citizens. In order to achieve these goals, the course should provide students skills that will make individuals active citizens in real life, such as taking part in campaigns, writing petitions, participating in peaceful demonstrations, discussing the problems of the people, and reading on national or international issues (Zarrillo, 2016, pp.199- 200). A teacher who wants to raise legal literate students with these skills must first have these skills. Undoubtedly, legal issues are one of the most essential areas of teacher preparation (Garner, 2000). Therefore, determining the tendencies of social studies teacher candidates, who are the teachers of the future, towards the use of certain fundamental rights as active and responsible citizens will give us an idea about whether future generations can be raised with sufficient awareness of these rights.

In today’s democratic societies, individuals take part in most of the democratic processes as active citizens as a requirement of participatory democracy (Belge, 2020). Active individuals obtain information on any personal or public issue with the right to petition, among the rights granted to them by law, know the importance of being a member of a union and become a member of any of them, consider lockout as a right of the employer and strike as the right of the workers, and if necessary, they can actively use these rights, they can also participate in meetings or demonstration marches on any subject, apply to the judiciary regarding all kinds of problems they encounter, and they know their rights as a conscious consumer and use these rights effectively by applying to consumer arbitration committees when necessary. Likewise, a democratic society needs responsible citizens (Patrick, 1999). Responsible citizens in a democratic society act with a sense of responsibility in many political and social areas, seek their rights on social media platforms, one of the most effective communication tools in today’s world, and take responsibility to raise social awareness on any issue, can use the e-government portal as a requirement of digital citizenship or, when necessary, CIMER (Presidential Communication Center) for their purposes.

In the literature, there are many studies on the use of fundamental rights discussed in this research. Some of these studies have been carried out on legal literacy (Posocco, 2016; Bain, 2009; Schimmel & Militello, 2011; Sönmez et al., 2019; Kara and Tangülü, 2017; Kara and Tangülü, 2021; Çengelci Köse and Bursa, 2020; Kutsyuruba, Murray & Hogenkamp, 2019); the right to unionize, strike and lockout (Kayıkçı, 2013; Çelik, 2019; Oğuzman, 1962), the right to assembly, demonstration and march (Tutkun, 2013; Şirin, 2013; Özenç, 2015), the right to petition and information (Hız and Yılmaz, 2004; İmren and Güven, 2007), the use of the right to access the court (Aydın, 2013; Çayan, 2016), consumer rights and their use (Sirmen, 2013; Usta, 2001), the use of e-government and CIMER (Şahin and Örselli, 2003; Demirci, 2015; Selvi et al., 2019), and the use of social media for participation and seeking rights (Çıldan et al., 2012; Akçay and Güler, 2020; Tutkun, 2013). In general, these studies are related to the legal dimension of fundamental rights, legal literacy or the problems experienced in their use. This study aimed to investigate the tendencies of students studying in social studies teacher education undergraduate programs at seven different state universities in different regions of Turkey, regarding the use of fundamental rights, which can also be expressed as ways to seek rights.

The Purpose of Study

This study aimed to investigate the tendencies of students studying in social studies teacher education undergraduate programs at seven different state universities in different regions of Turkey, regarding the use of fundamental rights, which can also be expressed as ways to seek rights. For this purpose, answers to the following questions were sought:

- Is the gender variable an effective factor for social studies teacher candidates to exercise their fundamental rights?

- Does the class level of social studies teacher candidates make a significant difference in their use of fundamental rights?
- Does the place of residence of social studies teacher candidates make a significant difference in their use of fundamental rights?
- What are the general tendencies of social studies teacher candidates toward exercising fundamental rights as active and responsible citizens?

METHOD

This section presents information regarding the model of research, the universe and sample of the study, the data collection tool, the data collection process, and the analysis of the collected data.

The Research Model

The research was carried out using the general survey model, which is one of the types of survey methodology. This model refers to screening the whole universe or a sample group or samples taken from it in order to reach a general opinion on a universe consisting of many elements (Karasar, 2004, pp.77-79). This model was chosen due to the relationship among variables of this study.

Universe and Sample

The universe/population of the research is social studies teacher candidates studying at 7 universities in different regions of Turkey, and the sample is social studies teacher candidates studying in different classes in these universities that are selected with the random sampling method. The demographic data of the research sample are presented in detail in Table 1.

As seen in Table 1, 247 (69.4%) of the students participating in the study were female and 109 (30.6%) were male. Of the students, 56 (15.7%) were at 1st-year, 127 (35.7%) at 2nd-year, 84 (23.6%) at 3rd-year and 89 (25%) at 4th-year. Of

Table 1. Demographic Information of Participants

Variables Sub-variables	f	%
Gender		
Female	247	69.4
Male	109	30.6
Undergraduate Class		
1 st year	56	15.7
2 nd year	127	35.7
3 rd year	84	23.6
4 th year	89	25
Place of residence		
Village	55	15.4
District	101	28.4
Province	200	56.2
Total	356	100

the students, 55 (15.4%) resided in the village, 101 (28.4%) in the district, and 200 (56.2%) in the city center.

Data Collection Tool and Process

A 50-item survey was used to determine the tendencies of social studies teacher candidates toward the use of fundamental rights. While preparing the survey, first of all, researchers reviewed existing literature and created a comprehensive pool of 250 items for the features to be measured. Then, the researchers studied the items, and similar items and items that were not closely related to the subject were eliminated, at a rate of about one-third. The number of items to be included in the survey was reduced to 55, and the form consisting of 55 items was presented to the expert opinion. Opinions were received from an assessment specialist, three faculty members in the field of political science and public administration, a language specialist, and two faculty members from the field of social studies education. Considering these opinions, some questions were removed and some questions were re-expressed in the form. Thus, the Survey on the Exercise of Fundamental Rights (SEFR) consisting of 48 items was created. The survey was transferred to Google Forms in a 5-point Likert format with response options “strongly agree”, “agree”, “undecided”, “disagree”, and “strongly disagree”. Studies referenced in the creation of individual survey items are shown in Table 2.

In addition to the survey form, researchers used a personal information form, which was developed by taking into account the expert opinions. The personal information form includes the gender, class, and place of residence of the students participating in the research. The form also includes an information note stating the purpose of the research and its compliance with ethical rules, and explanatory statements stating that participation in the study is on a voluntary basis

Table 2. Studies utilized in the creation of survey items

Related Item	Utilized studies*
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7	Duman (2004)
8,9,10,11,12, 13 and 47	Kenan (2007)
14, 15, 16, 17 and 18	Özkul (2011)
19, 20, 21, 22 and 23	Kutal (2013)
24, 25, 26, 27 and 28	Kaya and Güler (2015)
29	Uysal and Cömert (2017)
30	Tanyar (2011)
31, 32, 33 and 34	Bingül (2020)
35, 36 and 37	Arslan, Dil, Çetin and Yazıcı (2017)
38, 39 and 40	Ünal (2019)
41	Çetin (2007)
42	Yeşil (2018)
43	Tabak (2018)
44 and 45	Erdem and Koçyiğit (2019)
46	Türk (2013)
48	Şahin and Örselli (2003)

*While creating the items, some of these works only gave an idea about the relevant item.

and that the participants can leave the research at any time. The Cronbach's Alpha confidence coefficient of the questionnaire used in the study was found to be.881 and is considered an appropriate ratio for the reliability of obtained measures (Büyükoztürk et al., 2013, p. 109).

Data Analysis

SPSS 22.0 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) package program was used for data analysis and the significance level was accepted as.05. First of all, descriptive statistics were calculated for the participants' answers to the independent variables in the personal information form, and their frequencies and percentages were examined. Then, the data were tested for normal distribution to determine whether the SEFR scores of candidate teachers differ according to variables gender, class level and place of residence. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test determined that the data were normally distributed (.200). For independent groups, t-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) were used. When a significant difference was determined in at least one pair of means, the LSD test was performed to identify the groups with statistically different means (Can, 2014, pp. 126-158).

RESULTS

The findings of the study were presented according to the independent variables of gender, class level, and place of residence, respectively, and it was examined whether there was a difference according to these variables in the single-factor structure containing all the items of the survey and 10 sub-factor structure. Fundamental rights have been examined under the themes of active and responsible citizenship since some of the fundamental rights make the individual active depending on their characteristics and some of them make the individual a responsible citizen. There is still no clear limit to the examination of these rights under these categories. First of all, a t-test was performed for the gender variable, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 shows the variation of candidate teachers' mean SEFR scores and scores for each sub-factor by gender. As seen in Table 3, there was no gender difference in the scores obtained from the whole survey ($t=1.918$) and the sub-dimensions of the *active citizenship* factor including the *right to unionize* ($t=-.722$), *right to petition* ($t=1.633$), *right to strike* ($t=-.892$), *right to lockout* ($t=.194$), *right to assembly-demonstration marches* ($t=-.850$). Similarly, scores of the *responsible citizenship* sub-dimensions of *using social media* ($t=1.907$) and *using e-government and CIMER* ($t=1.469$) did not differ significantly by gender ($p>.05$). However, *active citizenship* sub-dimensions of *access to court* ($t=2.472$, $p=.014$), and *using consumer rights* ($t=3.416$, $p=.001$) and *responsible citizenship* sub-dimensions of *conscious citizenship and taking responsibility* ($t=3.357$, $p=.001$) differed significantly by gender ($p<.05$). The mean scores of female participants were higher in the sub-dimension of the *right to access court* ($\bar{x}=15.24$) than male participants ($\bar{x}=14.42$); and also higher in the dimension of *using consumer rights* ($\bar{x}=13.22$) than male participants ($\bar{x}=12.35$). In another

Table 3. The use of fundamental rights by gender

Citizenship Type	Factors	Gender	n	\bar{x}	df	t	p
Active citizenship	Right to unionize	Female	247	14.38	207.58	-0.722	0.471
		Male	109	14.61			
	Right to petition	Female	247	20.89	199.42	1.633	0.103
		Male	109	20.26			
	Right to strike	Female	247	17.59	215.19	-0.892	0.373
		Male	109	17.97			
	Right to lockout	Female	247	13.67	202.18	0.194	0.846
		Male	109	13.56			
	Right to assembly, demonstration, march	Female	247	23.93	191.74	-0.850	0.396
		Male	109	24.41			
	Right to access the court	Female	247	15.24	192.73	2.472	0.014*
		Male	109	14.42			
	Using consumer rights	Female	247	13.22	168.92	3.416	0.001*
		Male	109	12.35			
Responsible citizenship	Conscious citizenship and taking responsibility	Female	247	33.10	173.52	3.357	0.001*
		Male	109	31.00			
	Using social media	Female	247	15.92	211.26	1.907	0.057
		Male	109	15.23			
	Using e-government and CIMER	Female	247	12.29	189.13	1.469	0.143
		Male	109	11.90			
SEFR mean score		Female	247	3.76	1.92	1.918	0.056
		Male	109	3.66			

* Level of statistical significance ($p < 0.05$)

sub-dimension with a significant difference, the *dimension of conscious citizenship and taking responsibility*, compared to the male participants ($\bar{x}=31.00$), female participants had higher arithmetic averages ($\bar{x}=33.10$). The scores obtained from the overall scale, on the other hand, show that there is no significant difference in SEFR scores between female ($\bar{x}=3.76$) and male ($\bar{x}=3.66$) participants, and scores are quite close to each other.

To determine whether the candidate teachers' SEFR scores differ according to the class level variable, the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted, and the results of the test are given in Table 4.

The mean SEFR scores of the students by their class levels are shown in Table 4. The mean SEFR scores of the students showed no significant difference according to the class level ($F_{(3-352)} = 1.51, p > .05$). Accordingly, it is seen that the class levels of the students do not play a decisive role in the SEFR scores. Analysis of the sub-dimensions of the survey determined that the *active citizenship* sub-dimensions *right to petition*, *right to lockout*, *right of access to court* and the *responsible citizenship* sub-dimension of *conscious citizenship and taking responsibility* varied significantly by class level ($p < .05$). In order to find the source of the difference, the LSD test was applied in these dimensions. The LSD test revealed a difference in the dimension of *right to petition* between the 1st-year and the 4th-year, and between the 2nd-year and the 4th-year. Compared to 4th-year students ($\bar{x}=19.88$), 1st-year students ($\bar{x}=21.20$) stated that they found

it appropriate to use a petition to seek their rights. Similarly, 2nd-year students ($\bar{x}=21.04$) had a higher tendency to exercise their right to petition than 4th-year students ($\bar{x}=19.88$).

In the *right to lockout* dimension, the difference between the 1st-year and the 2nd, 3rd, 4th years and between the 2nd and 3rd years was significant. Accordingly, the mean score of 1st-year students ($\bar{x}=11.23$) was lower than 2nd-year ($\bar{x}=13.28$), 3rd-year ($\bar{x}=14.76$), and 4th-year students ($\bar{x}=14.61$). This finding shows that as students proceed to the upper classes, their sensitivity towards the use of the right to lockout increases. The significant difference in this sub-dimension between the mean scores of the 3rd-year ($\bar{x}=14.76$) and the 2nd-year ($\bar{x}=13.28$) students is in favor of the 3rd-year students.

There was also a significant difference between the 1st-year and the 3rd- and 4th-year students in the dimension of *the right to access to court*. Accordingly, the mean score of the 1st-year students ($\bar{x}=15.79$) was higher than the 2nd-year ($\bar{x}=15.19$), 3rd-year ($\bar{x}=14.63$), and 4th-year students ($\bar{x}=14.54$), and the significant difference was in favor of the 1st-year students.

The last sub-dimension with a significant difference is the dimension of *conscious citizenship and taking responsibility*. In this dimension, the LSD test revealed a significant difference between the 1st-year and the 2nd, 3rd and 4th years, and between the 2nd and 3rd years. Arithmetic averages of 1st-year students ($\bar{x}=12.41$) were higher than the 2nd-year ($\bar{x}=12.13$), 3rd-year ($\bar{x}=12.04$) and 4th-year students ($\bar{x}=12.20$). The significant difference between the 2nd-year and 3rd-year averages was in favor of the 2nd-year students.

Table 4. Use of fundamental rights by undergraduate class level

Citizenship Type	Factors	Class	n	\bar{x}	Std.D.	Source of variance	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	p	LSD
Active citizenship	Right to unionize	1 st year	56	14.13	3.34	Between groups	24.26	3	8.09	1.06	0.37	
		2 nd year	127	14.62	2.88							
		3 rd year	84	14.74	2.45	Within groups	2698.02	352	7.67			
		4 th year	89	14.16	2.48	Total	2722.28	355				
	Right to petition	1 st year	56	21.20	3.39	Between groups	88.81	3	29.60	2.62	0.050*	(1-4) (2-4)
		2 nd year	127	21.04	3.27							
		3 rd year	84	20.71	3.20	Within groups	3972.43	352	11.29			
		4 th year	89	19.88	3.61	Total	4061.24	355				
	Right to strike	1 st year	56	18.13	4.20	Between groups	30.84	3	10.28	0.73	0.54	
		2 nd year	127	17.92	4.00							
		3 rd year	84	17.42	3.16	Within groups	4983.19	352	14.16			
		4 th year	89	17.40	3.65	Total	5014.03	355				
	Right to lockout	1 st year	56	11.23	5.69	Between groups	530.45	3	176.82	7.35	0.000*	(1-2, 3 and 4) (2-3)
		2 nd year	127	13.28	4.84							
		3 rd year	84	14.76	4.82	Within groups	8473.81	352	24.07			
		4 th year	89	14.61	4.54	Total	9004.26	355				
Right to assembly, demonstration, march	1 st year	56	24.80	5.39	Between groups	80.78	3	26.93	1.11	0.35		
	2 nd year	127	24.38	5.25								
	3 rd year	84	23.79	4.02	Within groups	8535.02	352	24.25				
	4 th year	89	23.47	4.91	Total	8615.80	355					
Right to access the court	1 st year	56	15.79	2.53	Between groups	69.39	3	23.13	2.80	0.040*	(1-3 and 4)	
	2 nd year	127	15.19	3.11								
	3 rd year	84	14.63	2.69	Within groups	2904.57	352	8.25				
	4 th year	89	14.54	2.89	Total	2973.96	355					
Using consumer rights	1 st year	56	13.32	2.01	Between groups	28.69	3	9.56	1.91	0.13		
	2 nd year	127	13.09	2.24								
	3 rd year	84	12.99	2.24	Within groups	1765.50	352	5.02				
	4 th year	89	12.49	2.37	Total	1794.19	355					
Responsible citizenship	Conscious citizenship and taking responsibility	1 st year	56	34.95	4.14	Between groups	535.33	3	178.44	6.11	0.000*	(1-2, 3 and 4) (2-3)
		2 nd year	127	32.69	5.36							
		3 rd year	84	31.17	6.13	Within groups	10289.04	352	29.23			
		4 th year	89	31.78	5.45	Total	10824.37	355				

(Contd...)

Table 4. (Continued)

Citizenship Type	Factors	Class	n	\bar{x}	Std.D.	Source of variance	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	p	LSD	
SEFR mean score	Using social media	1 st year	56	16.45	3.13	Between groups	70.59	3	23.53	2.36	0.07		
		2 nd year	127	15.96	3.14								
		3 rd year	84	15.19	3.35	Within groups	3508.61	352	9.97				
		4 th year	89	15.38	3.01	Total	3579.20	355					
	Using e-government and CIMER	1 st year	56	12.41	2.18	Between groups	5.02	3	1.67	0.31	0.82		
		2 nd year	127	12.13	2.45								
		3 rd year	84	12.04	2.28	Within groups	1917.53	352	5.45				
		4 th year	89	12.20	2.31	Total	1922.55	355					
	SEFR mean score		1 st year	56	3.80	0.40	Between groups	0.83	3	0.28	1.51	0.21	
			2 nd year	127	3.76	0.43							
			3 rd year	84	3.70	0.41	Within groups	64.47	352	0.18			
			4 th year	89	3.66	0.46	Total	65.29	355				

The results of the ANOVA test performed on the data to determine whether the place of residence of the students, the third variable of the study, is a significant source of the difference in SEFR scores are presented in Table 5.

The mean SEFR scores of students according to their place of residence are shown in Table 5. The mean SEFR scores of the students showed no significant difference according to the place of residence ($F_{(2,353)}=39, p>.05$). Accordingly, the place of residence of the students being a province ($\bar{x}=3.74$), a district ($\bar{x}=3.69$) or a village ($\bar{x}=3.75$) did not play a decisive role in their SEFR scores. The analysis of the sub-dimensions of the survey also determined that the place of residence of the students is not a significant source of difference on any of the *active citizenship* and *responsible citizenship* sub-dimensions. However, average scores by the place of residence in these sub-dimensions, respectively, were higher for *the right to unionize* in provinces ($\bar{x}=32.64$), *the right to petition* in towns and villages ($\bar{x}=13.00$), *the right to strike* in villages ($\bar{x}=12.44$), *the right to lockout* in provinces ($\bar{x}=16.01$), *the right to demonstrate and march* in villages ($\bar{x}=15.47$), *the right to access the court* in provinces ($\bar{x}=24.16$), *consumer rights* in villages ($\bar{x}=14.78$), *conscious citizenship and taking responsibility* in provinces ($\bar{x}=18.00$), *using social media* in villages ($\bar{x}=21.11$) and *using e-government and CIMER* in districts ($\bar{x}=14.59$) than the other settlements.

The descriptive data regarding the general tendencies of the social studies teacher candidates toward fundamental rights, which were examined within the scope of the fourth question of the research, are given in Table 6.

As shown in Table 6, the scores obtained from the entire survey ranged from the lowest 1.75 to the highest 4.60, and the range between these scores was 2.85. The average score of the answers given by the students to the survey was 3.73. The overall assessment of these findings is that the general

tendencies of candidate teachers toward the use of fundamental rights examined within the scope of the research are above the average, but not very high.

DISCUSSION

The findings of the study indicate that the exercise of fundamental rights do not differ significantly according to the gender of the participants, but the tendencies of women to be both active and responsible citizens are higher than men. Regarding the use of fundamental rights, while men are more inclined to unionize, strike and organize meeting-demonstration marches, women have a higher tendency to use the right to petition, the right to access to court, and the use of consumer rights. Based on all these findings, it can be said that the preferences of women and men in exercising fundamental rights as a way of seeking rights are different. Problems encountered even in the most advanced democracies during the use of democratic rights such as union membership, taking part in a strike and assembly-demonstration march, or possible association of the use of these rights with violence may have affected the choices of men and women when seeking their rights. In the dimension of responsible citizenship, the tendencies of women toward conscious citizenship and to take responsibility for social issues, to seek their rights, or to raise awareness on any subject using social media tools, e-government portal and CIMER are higher than that of men. This finding supports the previous conclusion. It can be said that women seek their fundamental rights on an individual basis and in more acceptable ways, away from tension.

Previous studies on exercising fundamental rights as a means of seeking rights have also shown that women have higher attitudes than men (Akçay and Güler, 2021).

Table 5. The use of fundamental rights by the place of residence

Citizenship Type	Factors	Place of residence	n	\bar{x}	Std.D.	Source of variance	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	p	
Active citizenship	Right to unionize	Village	55	32.31	6.44	Between groups	24.26	2	3.03	0.39	0.68	
		District	101	32.19	5.08	Within groups	2698.02	353	7.70			
		Province	200	32.64	5.49	Total	2722.28	355				
	Right to petition	Village	55	13.00	2.26	Between groups	88.81	2	18.52	1.62	0.20	
		District	101	13.00	2.18	Within groups	3972.43	353	11.40			
		Province	200	12.92	2.29	Total	4061.24	355				
	Right to strike	Village	55	12.44	2.18	Between groups	30.84	2	27.50	1.96	0.14	
		District	101	11.92	2.29	Within groups	4983.19	353	14.05			
		Province	200	12.23	2.39	Total	5014.03	355				
	Right to lockout	Village	55	15.53	3.18	Between groups	530.45	2	52.08	2.07	0.13	
		District	101	15.23	3.48	Within groups	8473.81	353	25.21			
		Province	200	16.01	2.99	Total	9004.26	355				
	Right to assembly and demonstration marches	Village	55	15.47	3.35	Between groups	80.78	2	1.85	0.08	0.93	
		District	101	14.93	2.71	Within groups	8535.02	353	24.40			
		Province	200	14.89	2.85	Total	8615.80	355				
	Right to access the court	Village	55	24.09	4.99	Between groups	69.39	2	7.69	0.92	0.40	
		District	101	23.92	4.76	Within groups	2904.57	353	8.38			
		Province	200	24.16	5.01	Total	2973.96	355				
	Consumer rights	Village	55	14.78	5.51	Between groups	28.69	2	0.32	0.06	0.94	
		District	101	13.78	4.75	Within groups	1765.50	353	5.08			
		Province	200	13.25	5.01	Total	1794.19	355				
	Responsible citizenship	Conscious citizenship and taking responsibility	Village	55	16.89	3.55	Between groups	535.33	2	7.42	0.24	0.79
			District	101	17.57	3.94	Within groups	10289.04	353	30.62		
			Province	200	18.00	3.70	Total	10824.37	355			
Using social media		Village	55	21.11	3.37	Between groups	70.59	2	21.37	2.13	0.12	
		District	101	20.21	3.90	Within groups	3508.61	353	10.02			
		Province	200	20.83	3.08	Total	3579.20	355				
Using e-government and CIMER		Village	55	14.18	3.09	Between groups	5.02	2	5.39	1.00	0.37	
		District	101	14.59	2.91	Within groups	1917.53	353	5.42			
		Province	200	14.46	2.61	Total	1922.55	355				
SEFR mean score		Village	55	3.75	0.43	Between groups	0.83	2	0.71	0.39	0.68	
		District	101	3.69	0.46	Within groups	64.47	353	0.19			
		Province	200	3.74	0.41	Total	65.29	355				

Table 6. Descriptive data on the use of fundamental rights

	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. D.	Range
SEFR	356	1.75	4.60	3.73	3.75	3.77	0.43	2.85

Considering that the use of fundamental rights and efforts to protect these rights are the duty and responsibility of democratic citizenship, it can be said that the democratic attitudes of individuals are effective in the use of fundamental rights. Many related studies have determined gender to be effective on democratic attitude. However, while some of these studies (Şahan, 2018; Arslan and Çalmaşur, 2017; Erkensiz and Çetintaş, 2011; Ercoşkun and Nalçacı, 2009; Akın and Özdemir, 2009; Gömlüksiz and Kan, 2008; Bulut, 2006;

Karahan et al., 2006; Sağlam, 2000; Demoulin and Kolstad, 2000) revealed that women's average democratic attitudes were higher than men's, some studies reported higher scores for men (Çermik, 2013; Ektem and Sünbül, 2011; Ada and Koç, 2002). Based on all these, although the gender factor is not a dominant determinant on the tendency or democratic attitude towards the use and protection of fundamental rights, the fact that women gained democratic rights much later than men in many societies may have been influential

on women's tendencies towards the use and protection of these rights. Similarly, women's desire for their rights to be guaranteed by the state due to the male-dominated social structure may have positively affected the tendency to use these rights.

Another conclusion reached in this research is that the use of fundamental rights does not differ significantly according to the undergraduate class level of the students. Güler and Akçay (2021), in their previous studies on the attitude of claiming rights, also emphasized that although there was a significant difference in favor of senior students, the class level was not a significant source of difference in general. Nevertheless, in the present study, the first-year teacher candidates obtained higher mean scores from the survey. Besides the significant difference between classes in terms of active citizenship in the use of the right to petition, lockout, and access to court, 1st-year students were more likely to use all fundamental rights in this type of citizenship than other classes. Similarly, in the field of responsible citizenship, the mean scores of 1st-year students were higher than other class levels in all dimensions. In addition, although there was a significant difference in the dimension of conscious and responsible citizenship between all classes in favor of the 1st-year, and in favor of the 2nd-year when compared to the 3rd-year students, there was no difference between classes in the other sub-dimensions. Since one of the main objectives of the social studies teacher education undergraduate program in Turkey is to raise effective and responsible citizens, many courses are offered in this field. In this respect, the Political Science course is taught in the 1st-year, and this may have positively affected the tendencies of the lower classes. Accordingly, the elective Turkish Legal System course, which aims to educate teacher candidates with the necessary knowledge and skills on citizenship, rights and responsibilities, and which should be given after the 1st-year, is also included in the program. It is especially emphasized to include practice-based activities within the scope of this course, such as analysis of court decisions, case studies, use of the right to petition at the local and national level, etc. (Social Studies Education Undergraduate Program, 2018). It is thought that teaching this course effectively in the upper classes can increase students' awareness of the use of fundamental rights and legal literacy skills. On the other hand, the decrease in the tendency of social studies teacher candidates to use fundamental rights during their university education can be interpreted as an indication that the instructors do not show sufficient sensitivity to this issue or that the universities do not have the necessary supportive democratic environment in this regard (Şahin et al., 2009).

Within the scope of this research, it was understood that the tendencies of the candidate teachers towards the use of fundamental rights in both active and responsible citizenship dimensions did not change according to the place of residence. On the other hand, it can be said that the tendency of students residing in villages toward the use of fundamental rights is slightly higher than those residing in other settlements. Based on the average scores obtained from the sub-dimensions of active citizenship, it was observed that

those residing in provinces have a higher tendency in the use of unionization, lockout and access to court rights, while those residing in villages have a higher tendency to use their right to petition, strike, demonstrate and march, and to actively use consumer rights. In the dimension of responsible citizenship, students residing in districts are more inclined to use e-government and CIMER, while those residing in villages are more inclined to use social media. In the dimension of conscious and responsible citizenship, those who reside in provinces are more inclined to exercise their fundamental rights.

CONCLUSION

When evaluated in general, it can be concluded that the candidate teachers' tendencies towards the use of fundamental rights are at a moderate level. Although this result is similar to the findings of Akçay and Güler (2021), Çermik (2013) determined that candidate teachers' attitudes towards seeking their rights are low. While the presence of two different results on the subject makes it difficult to reach a common assessment, the fact that the democratic attitudes of social studies teacher candidates are higher than those of undergraduate students studying in other departments (Gömlüksiz and Kan, 2008) suggests that students are open to development regarding the use of fundamental rights. It is thought that as undergraduate students gain the opportunity to use the rights that are the subject of this study as active and responsible citizens, their tendency to use these rights and their awareness of the protection of rights will increase. As a matter of fact, previous studies have shown that membership in organizations, such as non-governmental organizations, has a positive effect on democratic attitudes (Akin and Özdemir, 2009; Karahan et al., 2006). However, the belief that unions cannot protect workers' rights (Urhan and Selamoğlu, 2008), and Turkey falling behind the democratic standards of the western world despite its desire to be in the western world of her own free will, being criticized in international forums on human rights, and therefore remaining in a defensive position (Kapani, 1991, p.112) can be considered as factors that negatively affect students' tendencies towards the use of fundamental rights. On the other hand, educational institutions should fulfill their duties in the best way possible in effectively teaching these democratic and fundamental human rights discussed in the present study. Of course, as Tepe (2011, p. 153) states, human rights education should not be expected to solve all problems of human rights and create a world where human rights violations never occur. However, to create a better democratic environment in Turkey, in other words, legal literate, it is crucial to raise active and responsible citizens who know their rights. However, to create a better democratic environment in Turkey, it is crucial to raise active and responsible citizens who know their rights and the legal literate.

Limitations

The theoretical framework of fundamental rights and the methodological analysis of these rights one by one are too

broad to be covered in a single article. The fact that some of the fundamental rights are examined in the field of civil rights and freedoms, some in the field of political rights, and some in the field of social, economic and cultural rights, and the lack of clear relations between some concepts are the factors that limited this study. For this reason, the study is limited to the active citizenship category and to the right to unionize, the right to petition, the right to strike, the right to lockout, the right to march, the right to access the court, and consumer rights, which are the rights that make the individual active in social life. Conscious citizenship and taking responsibility, using social media, using e-government and CIMER for individuals to seek and be aware of their rights as responsible citizens individually or in social unity, have been examined under the limited category of responsible citizenship.

REFERENCES

- Ada, Ş., & Koç, M. (2000). Üniversite öğrencilerinin lisans eğitimleri süresince demokratik tutumlardaki değişimlerin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi [The examining in terms of various variables of changes in democratic attitudes of university students during undergraduate education]. In *IX. National Educational Sciences Congress Proceedings* (pp. 796-808). Atatürk University Kazım Karabekir Faculty of Education, Erzurum.
- Akçay, P., & Güler, G. (2020). Üniversite öğrencilerinin hak arama tutumları [Right-seeking attitudes of university students]. In *EJER Congress 2020 Abstracts* (pp. 78-80). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/download/64992288/ejer_2020_ozet.pdf#page=95
- Akın, U., & Özdemir, M. (2009). The examination of teacher candidates' democratic values in terms of various variables: the case of faculty of educational sciences. *Journal of Faculty of Educational Sciences*, 42(2), 183-198. https://doi.org/10.1501/Egifak_0000001182
- Arslan, A., & Çalmaşur, H. (2017). Analysis of multiculturalism and democratic attitude of elementary and secondary grade teachers in the sense of various variables. *Atatürk University Journal of Kazım Karabekir Education Faculty*, 34, 90-109.
- Arslan, H., Dil, K., Çetin, E., & Yazıcı, S. (2017). Active citizenship self-efficacy scale: A reliability and validity study. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 14(3), 2797-2809. <https://doi:10.14687/jhs.v14i3.4771>
- Aydın, B. (2013). The right of access to a court in the area of administrative jurisdiction in Turkey. *Türkiye Adalet Akademisi Dergisi*, 15, 271-296.
- Bain, C. (2009). Untangling legal issues that affect teachers and student teachers. *Art Education*, 62(5), 47-53.
- Bal, H. (2012). *Hukuk sosyolojisi*. (3rd ed.). Fakülte Kitapevi.
- Beetham, D. (2006). *Demokrasi ve insan hakları*. (B. Canada, Trans.), Liberte Yayınları.
- Belge, Z. S. (2020). Planning process and the role of the planner in communities of active and passive citizens. *İdealkent*, 11(29), 350-372. DOI:10.31198/idealkent.681057
- Bingül, A. (2020). Hak arama hürriyeti [Freedom of seek right]. Retrieved from: <https://www.imgehukuk.com.tr/blog/hak-arama-hurriyeti>
- Bulut, N. (2006). The relations between the democratic attitudes of a group of university students and some variables. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 45(45), 37-59.
- Büyükoztürk, Ş., Çakmak, E. K., Akgün, Ö. E., Karadeniz, Ş., Demirel, F., (2013). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri [Scientific research methods]*. Pegem Academy Publication.
- Can, A. (2014). *SPSS ile bilimsel araştırma sürecinde nicel veri analizi [Quantitative data analysis in scientific research process with SPSS]*. Pegem Academy Publication.
- Çayan, G. (2016). The right of access to court in the light of European court of human rights and constitutional court decisions. *Türkiye Adalet Akademisi Dergisi*, 28, 235-272.
- Çeçen, A. (2013). Human rights and humanitarian law. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 8, 809-830. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/jyasar/issue/19146/203178>
- Çelik, A. (2019). Unionization, collective bargaining and strike tendencies in turkey through 2010's under the strain of symbiotic relationships and authoritarian corporatism. *International Journal of Management Economics and Business*, 15(15), 39-69. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17130/ijmeb.2019CEEIK201854097>
- Çermik, H. (2013). Pre-service teachers' democratic values and investigation of these values based on some variables. *Education Sciences*, 8(2), 261-274.
- Çetin, O. (2007). *The Freedom of justice demanding* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dokuz Eylül University Graduate School of Social Sciences, İzmir.
- Çıldan, C., Ertemiz, M., Tumuçin, H. K., Küçük, E., & Albayrak, D. (2012). *Role of social media in Political Participation and Actions*. Akademik Bilişim 2012 Congress Abstract, Retrieved from <https://ab.org.tr/ab12/bildiri/205.pdf>
- Coady, M. M., Corbett, E. A., Falconer, S. R., Grierson, J., Smith, D. & Gregory V. (1950). A working philosophy for Canadian adult education. Kidd, J. R. (Ed.). In *Adult Education in Canada* (pp. 11-39), Canadian Association for Adult Education. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED024875>
- Demirci, K. (2015). E-government applications in turkey from the point of state-citizens relations: The BIMER case. *The Journal of Akdeniz University's Faculty of Communication*, 23, 96-113.
- Demoulin, D. F., & Kolstad, R. (2000). Assessing the gains of behavioral dynamics essential for success in democracy for teacher education students. *College Student Journal*, 34(3), 417- 422.
- Duman, B. (2004). *The Authority to conclude collective work contract according to the Law of Collective Work Contract, Strike and Lockout numbered 2822* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Marmara University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.

- Ektem, I. S., & Sünbül, A. M. (2011A) A study into the democratic attitudes of the prospective teachers. *Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education Journal*, 31, 159-168.
- Ercoşkun, M. H., & Nalçacı, A. (2008). The investigation of the empathic skills and democratic attitudes of the primary school teacher candidate. *Milli Eğitim*, 37(180), 204-215.
- Erdem, C., & Koçyiğit, M. (2019). Exploring undergraduates' digital citizenship levels: adaptation of the digital citizenship scale to Turkish. *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 7(3), 22-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17220/mojet.2019.03.003>
- Erdoğan M., Arslan Z., Uzak A., Altuntaş M. & Birincioğlu, A.Y. (2006). *İnsan hakları: Temel bilgiler, koruma mekanizmaları, il ve ilçe insan hakları kurulları [Human rights: Basic information, protection mechanisms, provincial and district human rights committees]*. Matus.
- Ertan, B. (2013). Yeni insan hakları [New human rights]. K. Akkoyunlu Ertan (Ed.), In *Yeni kuşak insan hakları [New generation human rights]* (pp. 23-46), Institute of Public Administration for Turkey and the Middle East.
- Ertuğrul, H., & Turpçu, H. (2018). *Temel hukuk [Basic law]*. (8th Ed.). Nobel.
- Garner, D. R. (2000). The knowledge of legal issues needed by teachers and student teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Bowling Green, KY.
- Gömleksiz, M. N., & Kan, A. Ü. (2008). Eğitim fakültesi ve tezsiz yüksek lisans programlarına kayıtlı öğretmen adaylarının demokratik tutumlarının değerlendirilmesi [Evaluation of the democratic attitudes of teacher candidates enrolled education faculties and non-thesis master's programs]. *Milli Eğitim*, 178(1), 44-64.
- Hablemitoğlu, Ş., & Özmete, E. (2012). A suggestion for effective citizenship education. *Ankara University Faculty of Health Sciences*, 1(3), 39-54.
- Hız, Y., & Yılmaz, Z. (2004). *Bilgi edinme ve dilekçe hakkı: Açıklamalı, notlu, gerekçeli [Right to information and petition: expository, annotated, reasoned]*. Seçkin.
- İmren, E. Ş., & Güven, A. (2007). Demokratik ve şeffaf yönetimi anlamlandıran bir hak: Bilgi edinme hakkı [A right that gives meaning to democratic and transparent administration: The right to information]. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 2(1), 257-272.
- Kaboğlu, İ. Ö. (2004). İnsan haklarına yönelik örtülü bir tehdit: 3D eksikliği [A veiled threat to human rights: the lack of 3D.]. In İ. Kaçuradi (Ed.), *Threats to human rights in the beginning of the twenty-first century* (pp. 23-46), Hacettepe University Human Rights and Philosophy Research and Application Center.
- Kaçuradi, I. (2016). *İnsan hakları: Kavramları ve sorunları [Human rights: Concepts and problems]*. (3rd Ed.). Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu.
- Kapani, M. (1991). *İnsan haklarının uluslararası boyutu [The international dimension of human rights]*. (2nd Ed.). Bilgi Publishing House.
- Kara, H., & Tangülü, Z. (2017). A case study on legal and political literacy at the social studies curriculum. *Research and Experience Journal (REJ)*, 2(1), 1-28.
- Kara, H., & Tangülü, Z. (2021). Determination of legal literacy levels of social studies teacher candidates studying in turkey. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 7(1), 341-359.
- Karahan, T. F., Sardoğan, M. E., Özkamalı, E. ve Dicle, A. N. (2006). Democratic attitude, neurotic tendencies and self-actualization in prospective-teachers. *H.U. Journal of Education* 30, 149-158
- Kaya, P. A., & Güler, C. (2015). Collective action right in international law of human rights. *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*, 68, 105-126. <http://dergipark.gov.tr/iusskd>
- Kayar, İ., & Üzülmez, İ. (2017). *Hukukun temel kavramları [The basic concepts of law]* (10th Ed.). Seçkin.
- Kayıkçı, K. (2013). Unionization in the public and education sector in turkey, and expectations of school administrators and teachers expectations from unions. *Amme İdaresi Dergisi*, 47(1), 99-126.
- Kenan, K. (2007). *Right of petition in Turkey* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Gazi University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Köse, T. Ç., & Bursa, S. (2020). Pre-service social studies teachers' perceptions of legal literacy. *Journal of Uludağ University Faculty of Education*, 33(2), 372-388.
- Kutal, M. (2013). Hukuki açıdan lokavt [Lockout in terms of law]. *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*, 24, 159-190.
- Kutsyuruba, B., Murray, J., & Hogenkamp, S. (2019). Understanding Pre-Service Teachers' Legal Literacy and Experiences with Legal Issues in Practicum Placements: An Exploratory Study. *Canadian journal of educational administration and policy*, 191, 54-71.
- Oğuzman, K. (1962) Toplu sözleşme grev ve lokavt kanunu tasarısi tahlil ve tenkidi [Analysis and criticism of the collective agreement strike and lockout law draft]. *Journal of Istanbul University Law Faculty*, 28(2), 407-429.
- Öktem, N., & Türkbağ, A.U. (2014). *Felsefe, sosyoloji, hukuk ve devlet [Philosophy, sociology, law and the state]* (6th ed.). Dar Publications.
- Özkul, Z. (2011). *Right to strike in the Turkish Constitutional order and in international human rights conventions* [Unpublished master's thesis]. İstanbul University Institute of Social Sciences, İstanbul.
- Patrick, J. J. (1999). The Concept of Citizenship in Education for Democracy. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED432532>
- Posocco, S. C. L. (2016). *The importance of legal literacy in education* [Master of Teaching thesis]. University of Toronto.
- Sağlam, F. (2011). İnsan hakları evrensel bildirgesinin BM'de kabulünün 60. Yıldönümünde sosyal haklar [Social rights in the 60th Anniversary of the agreement of the universal declaration of human rights in the UN.]. In *İnsan hakları evrensel bildirgesinin 60. yılında insan hakları [Human rights in the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights]* İ. Kaçuradi (Ed), (pp.113-119), Maltepe University Publications, No. 42.
- Sağlam, H. İ. (2000). Sosyal bilgiler dersinin demokratik tutum geliştirmedeki rolü [The role of social studies

- course in developing democratic attitudes]. *Milli Eğitim*, 147, 67-71.
- Şahan, G. (2018). Evaluation of democratic owners who have teacher nominated formation education. *Turkish Studies*, 13(4), 1045-1056. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.13006>
- Şahin, A., & Örselli, E. (2003). E-devlet anlayışı sürecinde Türkiye [Turkey in the process of e-government understanding.]. *Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute Journal (SUSBED)* 9, 343-356.
- Şahin, İ., Şahin-Fırat, N., Zoraloğlu, Y.R. & Açıkgöz, K. (2009). The problems of university students. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy*, 4(4), 1435-1449. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/nwsaedu/issue/19826/212403>
- Schimmel, D., & Militello, M. (2011). The risks of legally illiterate teachers: The findings, the consequences and the solution. *University of Massachusetts Law Review*, 6(1), 37-55.
- Schopenhauer, A. (2013). *İnsan doğası üzerine [On human nature]*. (E. Yıldırım, Trans.). Oda Publications.
- Selvi, Ö., Ulucan, M., & Coşgun, A. E. (2019). Public relations and CIMER as an e-government application. *Akademik Bakış Dergisi*, 75, 13-37.
- Şirin, T. (2013). Constitutional problems of freedom of assembly in turkey. *Journal of Constitutional Law*, 2(4), 289-316.
- Sirmen, L. (2013). The purpose and the characteristics of consumer law. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 8(1), 2465-2476.
- Sönmez, Ö. F., İrşi, E., Önlen, M., & Polat, U. (2019). 2018 investigation of 2018 secondary school curriculum in terms of legal literacy. *Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty*, 20(2), 906-928.
- Tabak, B. (2018). Emniyete veya savcılığa şikayet nasıl yapılır? [How to make a complaint to the police or prosecution office]. Retrieved from <https://www.tabakhukuk.com/emniyete-veya-savciliga-sikayet-nasil-yapilir>
- Tanyar, Z. Ç. (2011). Right to freedom of assembly under the case law of European court of human rights. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi [Journal of Ankara University Faculty of Law]*, 60(3), 593-634.
- Tepe, H. (2011). İnsan hakları eğitiminden beklenenler [Expectations from human rights education]. In İ. Kaçuradi (Ed.), *İnsan hakları evrensel bildirgesinin 60. yılında insan hakları [Human rights in the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights]* (pp.152-157), Maltepe University Publications, No. 42.
- Tepe, H. (2013). İnsan hakları ve evrensellik tartışması [Human rights and universality debate]. In K. Akkoyunlu Ertan (Ed.), *Yeni kuşak insan hakları [New generation human rights]* (pp. 23-46), Institute of Public Administration for Turkey and the Middle East.
- Tepe, H. (2014). Rethinking human nature as a basis for human rights. In M. Albers T. Hoffmann & J. Reinhardt (Eds.), *In Human Rights and Human Nature*, (pp.57-77), Springer.
- Türk, G. D. (2013). Demokrasinin dördüncü kuvveti yeni medya teknolojileri [New media technologies as the fourth force of democracy]. XVIII.Internet Conference of Turkey Proceedings, 55-60.
- Tutkun, T. (2013). *The relationship between teacher candidates' media literacy level and participation levels to representative democracy, protest and social change dimensions of active citizenship* [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University.
- Ünal, F. (2019). *Vatandaşlık yaklaşımları, vatandaşlık bilinci karma araştırma örneği [Citizenship approaches: an example of citizenship awareness mixed research]*. Pegem Academy Publication. DOI 10.14527/9786056991639.
- Urhan, B., & Selamoğlu, A. (2008). Workers' attitudes and behaviours towards the trade unions; the case of kocaeli. *Labour and Society*, 3(18), 171-197.
- Uysal, A., & Cömert, Y. (2017). Motivation of consumers for participation in boycotts: the example of Muş. *Journal of Academic Approaches*, 8(1), 97-125.
- Yeşil, R. (2018). The scale of civilization perception: the validity and reliability study. *MANAS Journal of Social Studies*, 7(1), 77-88.