



<http://www.eab.org.tr>

Available online at:

[http://www.eab.org.tr/public/ijrte/3/2/t\\_tutkun.pdf](http://www.eab.org.tr/public/ijrte/3/2/t_tutkun.pdf)

Educational Research Association The International Journal of  
Research in Teacher Education  
2012, 3(2): 1-13  
ISSN: 1308-951X



<http://ijrte.eab.org.tr>

## CIVIC COMPETENCE LEVEL OF TEACHER CANDIDATES WITHIN THE EUROPEAN UNION CONTEXT

**Lecturer Tugay TUTKUN**

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education  
tugay@comu.edu.tr

**Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Kaan DEMİR**

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education  
mkdemir2000@yahoo.com

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Salih Zeki GENÇ**

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education  
szgenc@yahoo.com

**Assoc. Prof. Dr. Çavuş ŞAHİN**

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Faculty of Education  
csahin25240@yahoo.com

---

### Abstract

Citizenship is no longer understood as only voting on elections, volunteering, and believing in public service of governments. Contemporary understanding of citizenship stress “individual participation and influence on public life”. So that, Concept of citizenship needs to be reshaped with interpretation of society, democracy and participation. Civic competencies are learning outcomes acquired by different forms of education (formal, non-formal and informal) and required for being an active citizen. European Union attaches great importance to education in order to reach union’s democracy-related goals. Member countries are supported for developing civic competences. Turkey was officially recognized as a candidate for full membership to the EU. Negotiations were started on 3 October 2005. “Judiciary & Fundamental Rights”, “Justice, Freedom & Security” and “Education & Culture” are related subjects to the content of this study. These 3 negotiation chapters are not yet opened to discussion they will be among popular topics in the near future. Because of being a part of the community and their effect on students understandings of citizenship, teachers are one of the social groups needed be examined in terms of their level of civic competence. Since civic competencies are developed by formal, non-formal and informal education, examination of teacher candidates’ civic competences based on only teacher education curriculum in terms of goals and content would not be adequate. Effect of hidden curriculum is also need to be examined. In this context, examining teacher candidates’ level of civic competences in Turkey within the EU context becomes important and states the aim of this study.

**Keywords:** citizenship, civic competencies, teacher candidates

---

### Introduction

Origins of the concept “citizenship” lean on the Greek city-states (Doğanay, 2009; Heater, 2004). According to Aristotle, citizenship is a socially and politically privileged status (Kaya, 2005). Citizens are distinguished from other inhabitants, such as resident aliens and slaves; and even children and seniors are not unqualified citizens. Aristotle defines the citizen as a person who has the right to participate in deliberative or

judicial office (Morrison, 1999). Citizenship meant having rights to have possessions, immunities, expectations, which were available in many kinds and degrees for many kinds of reason in Roman Empire times where citizenship was more impersonal, universal, multiform, having different degrees and applications (Pocock, 1998).

In the middle ages, citizenship was usually associated with cities and nobility used to have privileges above commoners. This distinction and privileges revoked by the French Revolution that invented both nation-state and modern institution and ideology of national citizenship (Brubaker, 1989). Since then, citizenship is understood as patriotism, dependence and obedience to the state (Doğanay & Sarı, 2009). Every state defined its citizenry and attached certain rights such as political rights and obligations to the definition of citizenship (Brubaker, 1989). Citizenship became an idealized concept indicating the bond between a person and the state in the rather abstract sense of having rights and duties (Heater, 2004).

In the modern times, one of the most influencing studies about citizenship is done by Marshall in 1950 (*Citizenship and Social Class*). “Civil rights” in the eighteenth century, “political rights” in the nineteenth century and “social rights” in the twentieth century were stated as three elements of citizenship which evolved in time (Marshall, 1950). Civil rights include “*individual freedom—liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts*”. Political rights include “*the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body*”. Social rights include “*the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society*” (Marshall, 1950, s. 148-149). Marxist critics state that Marshall's idea does not discuss the right of the citizen to control economic production, which they argue is necessary for sustained shared prosperity (Poulantzas, 1973). Marshall's idea about citizenship has also been criticized on the basis that it only applies to English men (Fraser & Gordon, 1992). Feminist also criticized Marshall's work for ignoring the social rights of women and impediments to their realization (Turner, 1993).

From the ancient times, definition of the term citizenship has never been static it changes in each society. Citizenship is seen by most scholars as culture-specific, in the sense that the meaning of the term varies from culture to culture, and over time (Rogers, 2002). Today, citizenship is usually seen as three competing underlying theories by many scholars; liberal-individualist, communitarian and civic-republican (Ignatieff & Pocock, 1995; Jochum, Pratten, & Wilding, 2005; Jones & Gaventa, 2002).

Liberal theories see citizenship as a status entitles individuals to a specific set of rights granted by the state. According to Oldfield (1998, s. 2), central thought of liberal citizenship is “*the notion that individual citizens act rationally to advance their own interests, and that the role of the state is to protect citizens in the exercise of their rights*”. Most of these rights are related to political participation. Granting the same rights to every individual is seen as promoting the equality. Marshall's conceptualization of citizenship could be labeled as liberal, since he stressed the elements of citizenship as civil, political and social rights.

Communitarian theories centralized on the notion of the socially-embedded citizen and community belonging (Smith, 1998). Individual liberty is maximized through public service and the prioritization of the

common good over the pursuit of individual interests (Skinner, 1992). In contrast to liberal thoughts communitarian theory of citizenship assert the group as the defining center of identity (Isin & Wood, 1999).

Civic-republican theory is based on the idea of “culture of participation” and emerged from the efforts on incorporation of liberal and communitarian conceptualization of the term. The civic-republican conception of the term emphasizes man's political nature, and sees citizenship as an active, not passive, activity (Pocock, 1998; Ignatieff & Pocock, 1995). Civic-republican thought promotes binding citizens together into a community and deliberative forms of democracy. According to Kostakopoulou (1994, s. 13) “*civic-republicanism emphasizes the democratic participation inherent in citizenship, and can channel legitimate frustrations and grievances and bring people together to focus on matters of common concern and lead to a politics of empowerment*”. In civic-republican thought, focus is more on citizen’s involvement in decision making and deliberative democracy in which people are involved in the negotiations over policy development (Barber, 2003; Mutz, 2006).

Today, civil, political and social rights that Marshall (1950) discussed is seen as inadequate to define citizenship and research on citizenship has begun to focus on citizens’ participation in political processes, and places a strong emphasis on individual action with the intent to influence (Verba & Nie, 1972; Jones & Gaventa, 2002).

The term “active citizenship” makes this change clear towards individual participation and being influential in policy development process. Within the EU context active citizenship is defined as “way of empowering citizens to have their voice heard within their communities, a sense of belonging and a stake in the society in which they live, the value of democracy, equality and understanding different cultures and different opinions” (European Commission, 1998). Hoskins (2006, s. 462) defines the term “active citizenship” and states the activities included within the term as follows;

*“Active citizenship is participation in civil society, community and/or political life, characterized by mutual respect and non-violence and in accordance with human rights and democracy. This definition of Active Citizenship includes a broad variety of participatory activities. It ranges from participatory democracy, including actions that hold governments accountable, to representative democracy, including actions such as voting, and also to participation in the everyday life of the communities”.*

In order to ensure the continuation of participatory and representative democracy, to reduce the gap between citizens and governing institutions and to enhance social cohesion, the term, “active citizenship” is used within EU policy making to state and promote these particular forms of participation. Since education is one of the key policy areas for achieving democracy related goals in EU, European Commission have developed indicators to define the status of active citizenship across Europe. Thus, a research project, “active citizenship in a learning context” began in order to determine the indicators of active citizenship. Firstly, “Active Citizenship Composite Indicator (ACCI)” is developed and reported by (Hoskins, et al., 2006) for this purpose.

As a learning outcome civic competence which means the ability required for enabling individuals to become active citizens became the focus of EU education policy: This competence is stated as one of the eight

key competences of economic success and greater social inclusion in Europe (Education Council, 2006). This competence which needed to enable individuals to become an active citizen include cognitive (knowledge, skills) and affective dimension (attitudes and values) (Hoskins B. , Villalba, Van Nijlen, & Barber, 2008). Communication skills, problem solving skills, critical and creative thinking skills, decision making skills, responsibility, awareness of diversity, and the attitudes and values of solidarity, human rights, equality and democracy are stressed as coverage of civic competence (Tiana, 2004; Hoskins, et al., 2008; European Council, 2009).

### **Problem State**

Citizenship is no longer understood as only voting on elections, volunteering, and believing in public service of governments. Contemporary understanding of citizenship in EU stresses “individual participation and influence on public life”. So that, concept of citizenship needs to be reshaped with interpretation of society, democracy and participation. Civic competencies are learning outcomes acquired by different forms of education (formal, non-formal and informal) and required for being an active citizen.

Since active citizenship is one of the four major policy goals in the 2020 Education and Training policy agenda (ET 2020), EU continues to support national governments in developing key competences, including civic competences, of its citizens (Hoskins, Villalba, & Saisana, 2012). In March 2011, education ministers of EU states came together to discuss the status of active citizenship within EU. As a result of this meeting Center for Research on Education and Lifelong learning (CRELL) is supported for development of new composite indicator on civic competence.

Turkey was officially recognized as a candidate for full membership on 12 December 1999, at the Helsinki summit of the European Council and negotiations were started on 3 October 2005. “Judiciary & Fundamental Rights”, “Justice, Freedom & Security” and “Education & Culture” are related subjects to the content of this study. Although these 3 of 35 negotiation chapters are not yet opened to discussion (European Commission, 2012) they will be among popular topics in the near future.

Because of being a part of the community and their effect on their students’ understandings of citizenship, teachers are one of the social groups needed be examined in terms of their level of civic competence. Since civic competencies are developed by formal, non-formal and informal education, examination of teacher candidates’ civic competences based on only teacher education curriculum in terms of goals and content would not be adequate.

In this context, examining teacher candidates’ level of civic competences in Turkey within the EU context becomes important and states the aim of this study.

### **Aim of the Study**

This study aims to explore the overall civic competence level of candidate teachers in ÇOMU within the EU context. Within this aim, this study tries to answer the following problems;

1. whether or not the means of students are all equal.

2. whether or not the means of 1<sup>st</sup> graders and 4<sup>th</sup> graders are all equal,
3. whether or not the means of female and male students are all equal,

## Method

### Research Design

Comparative descriptive research design applied in this study and survey technique is used to collect data. Collected data is presented as frequency and ratio. Other than this, t-test applied to compare grade and gender differences on civic competence level and its sub dimensions. ANOVA with multiple comparisons (Tukey) is conducted to whether or not the means of department students are all equal.

### Participants

Population of this study is candidate teachers in Faculty of Education at Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. Sample of the study is 514 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade student teachers in the department of Elementary School Teaching (EST), Computer and Instructional Technology (CIT), English Language Teaching (ELT), and Turkish Language Teaching (TLT).

**Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Gender, Grade and Department**

Grade	Department	Gender		Total
		F	M	
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade	Computer And Instructional Technology (CIT)	38	37	75
	Elementary School Teaching (EST)	41	16	57
	English Language Teaching (ELT)	43	18	61
	Turkish Language Teaching (TLT)	33	19	52
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Computer And Instructional Technology (CIT)	33	42	75
	Elementary School Teaching (EST)	44	15	59
	English Language Teaching (ELT)	48	24	72
	Turkish Language Teaching (TLT)	42	19	61
TOTAL		322	190	512

Table 1 show the number of students participated in this study with their gender, grade and departments. There were 75 1<sup>st</sup> graders and 75 4<sup>th</sup> graders (total=150) in CIT; 57 1<sup>st</sup> graders and 59 4<sup>th</sup> graders (total=116) in EST; 61 freshmen and 72 senior students (total=133) in ELT and 52 freshmen and 61 juniors (total=113) in TLT. 322 of these students were female and 190 of them were male; 245 were 1<sup>st</sup> graders and 267 were 4<sup>th</sup> graders.

### Research Instruments

Civic Competence Composite Indicator (CCCI) scale was used to measure civic competence level of candidate teachers. CCCI is consisting of 4 dimensions/subscales; “participatory attitudes”, “citizenship values”, “social justice values” and “knowledge and skills for democracy”.

Scales were translated into Turkish language prior to administering the study. Two bilingual Turkish scholars independently translated scale items, and compared their translations to resolve any disagreements. From this translation, a Turkish-English bilingual supervisor translated it back into English and discrepancies emerging from this back-translation were discussed, and the adjustments to the Turkish translation of the CCCI were made and named as CCCI-TR. This Turkish version of CCCI administered to 71 3<sup>rd</sup> grade Turkish language teaching students and a reliability analysis was carried out to check the statistical quality of the scale. The Cronbach's alpha for all scales were satisfactory; participatory attitudes (.84), citizenship values (.82), social justice values (.86) and knowledge and skills for democracy (.88).

## Finding and Results

**Table 2. t-test Results Comparing 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> Graders' Level of Civic Competence and Sub dimensions**

	Grade	n	M	SD	t	df	p
Civic Competence (OVERALL)	1. Grade	245	3,22	0,264	-2,468	510	0,014*
	4. Grade	267	3,27	0,249			
Citizenship values	1. Grade	245	3,236	0,346	-2,951	510	0,003*
	4. Grade	267	3,322	0,313			
Social justice values	1. Grade	245	3,360	0,391	-1,906	510	0,057
	4. Grade	267	3,424	0,372			
Participatory attitudes	1. Grade	245	2,848	0,372	-2,622	510	0,009*
	4. Grade	267	2,930	0,335			
Knowledge and skills for democracy	1. Grade	245	3,415	0,354	0,261	510	0,794
	4. Grade	267	3,407	0,352			

\*  $p < .05$

On average 4<sup>th</sup> graders overall civic competence level is higher ( $M = 3.27$ ,  $SD = .26$ ) than the 1<sup>st</sup> graders ( $M = 3.22$ ,  $SD = .25$ ). This difference was significant;  $t(510) = -2.468$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .11$ .

Level of citizenship values of 4<sup>th</sup> graders were higher ( $M = 3.32$ ,  $SD = .31$ ) than the 1<sup>st</sup> graders ( $M = 3.24$ ,  $SD = .35$ ). This difference was significant;  $t(510) = -2.951$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .13$ . Level of social justice values of 4<sup>th</sup> graders were higher ( $M = 3.42$ ,  $SD = .37$ ) than the 1<sup>st</sup> graders ( $M = 3.36$ ,  $SD = .39$ ). This difference was not significant;  $t(510) = -1.906$ ,  $p > .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .09$ . Level of participatory attitudes of 4<sup>th</sup> graders were higher ( $M = 2.93$ ,  $SD = .34$ ) than the 1<sup>st</sup> graders ( $M = 2.85$ ,  $SD = .37$ ). This difference was significant;  $t(510) = -2.622$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .12$ . Level of knowledge and skills for democracy of 4<sup>th</sup> graders were lower ( $M = 3.40$ ,  $SD = .35$ ) than the 1<sup>st</sup> graders ( $M = 3.42$ ,  $SD = .35$ ). This difference was not significant;  $t(510) = 0.261$ ,  $p > .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .00$ .

**Table 3. Analysis of Variance for Civic Competence and Sub dimensions of 1<sup>st</sup> Graders**

		SS	df	MS	F	p
Civic (OVERALL)	Competence					
	Between groups	,535	3	,178		
	Within groups	16,507	241	,068	2,603	,053
Total		17,042	244			
Citizenship values	Between groups	0,929	3	,310		
	Within groups	28,237	241	,117	2,643	0,050
	Total	29,166	244			
Social justice values	Between groups	0,832	3	,277		
	Within groups	36,549	241	,152	1,829	0,143
	Total	37,381	244			
Participatory attitudes	Between groups	1,413	3	,471		
	Within groups	32,366	241	,134	3,507	0,016*
	Total	33,779	244			
Knowledge and skills for democracy	Between groups	0,872	3	,291		
	Within groups	29,726	241	,123	2,357	0,072
	Total	30,598	244			

\* p &lt; .05

A one-way ANOVA was used to test for level of civic competence and sub dimensions in 1<sup>st</sup> graders. Overall civic competence level of 1<sup>st</sup> graders was not differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 241) = 2.603, p = .053$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicate that only the TLT group ( $M = 3.30, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.24, 3.35]$ ) gave significantly higher civic competence level than the CIT group ( $M = 3.16, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.10, 3.23]$ ),  $p = .031$ .

Level of citizenship values of 1<sup>st</sup> graders was not differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 241) = 2.643, p = .050$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicate that only the ELT group ( $M = 3.18, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.08, 3.27]$ ) gave significantly lower citizenship values level than the TLT group ( $M = 3.35, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.27, 3.42]$ ),  $p = .043$ . Level of social justice values of 1<sup>st</sup> graders was not differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 241) = 1.829, p = .143$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups also indicate that there were no significant differences across four groups. Level of participatory attitudes of 1<sup>st</sup> graders was differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 241) = 3.507, p = .016$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicate that only the EST group ( $M = 2.77, 95\% \text{ CI } [2.76, 2.93]$ ) gave significantly lower participatory attitudes level than the TLT group ( $M = 2.99, 95\% \text{ CI } [2.88, 3.09]$ ),  $p = .013$ . Level of knowledge and skills for democracy of 1<sup>st</sup> graders was not differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 241) = 2.357, p = .072$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups also indicate that there were no significant differences across four groups.

**Table 4. t-test Results Comparing 1<sup>st</sup> Graders' Gender and Level of Civic Competence and Sub dimensions**

		Grade	n	M	SD	t	df	p
Civic (OVERALL)	Competence	F	155	3.24	.250	1.709	243	.089
		M	90	3.18	.285			
Citizenship values		F	155	3,253	0,331	1,032	243	0,303
		M	90	3,207	0,370			
Social justice values		F	155	3,431	0,364	3,806	243	0,000*
		M	90	3,238	0,409			
Participatory attitudes		F	155	2,835	0,327	-0,699	243	0,485
		M	90	2,870	0,441			
Knowledge and skills for democracy	for	F	155	3,427	0,335	0,715	243	0,476
		M	90	3,394	0,386			

\* p &lt; .05

On average female 1<sup>st</sup> graders' overall civic competence level is higher (M = 3.24, SD = .25) than the male 1<sup>st</sup> graders (M = 3.18, SD = .29). This difference was not significant;  $t(243) = 1.709$ ,  $p > .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .11$ .

Level of female 1<sup>st</sup> graders' citizenship values were higher (M = 3.25, SD = .33) than the male 1<sup>st</sup> graders (M = 3.21, SD = .37). This difference was not significant;  $t(243) = 1.032$ ,  $p > .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .13$ .

Level of female 1<sup>st</sup> graders' social justice values were higher (M = 3.43, SD = .36) than the male 1<sup>st</sup> graders (M = 3.24, SD = .41). This difference was significant;  $t(243) = 3.806$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .24$ .

Level of female 1<sup>st</sup> graders' participatory attitudes were lower (M = 2.84, SD = .33) than the male 1<sup>st</sup> graders (M = 2.87, SD = .45). This difference was not significant;  $t(243) = -0.699$ ,  $p > .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .05$ .

Level of female 1<sup>st</sup> graders' knowledge and skills for democracy were higher (M = 3.43, SD = .34) than the male 1<sup>st</sup> graders (M = 3.39, SD = .39). This difference was not significant;  $t(243) = -0.715$ ,  $p > .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .05$ .

**Table 5. Analysis of Variance for Civic Competence and Sub dimensions of 4<sup>th</sup> Graders**

		SS	df	MS	F	p
Civic	Competence Between groups	1,364	3	,455	7,901	,000*

(OVERALL)	Within groups	15,137	263	,058	
	Total	16,502	266		
Citizenship values	Between groups	0,615	3	0,205	
	Within groups	25,518	263	0,097	2,114 0,099
	Total	26,134	266		
Social justice values	Between groups	6,732	3	2,244	
	Within groups	30,013	263	0,114	19,664 0,000*
	Total	36,744	266		
Participatory attitudes	Between groups	,653	3	0,218	
	Within groups	29,124	263	0,111	1,965 0,120
	Total	29,777	266		
Knowledge and skills for democracy	Between groups	3,922	3	1,307	
	Within groups	29,119	263	0,111	11,809 0,000*
	Total	33,041	266		

\*  $p < .05$

A one-way ANOVA was used to test for level of civic competence and sub dimensions in 4<sup>th</sup> graders. Overall civic competence level of 4<sup>th</sup> graders was differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 263) = 7.901, p = .000$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicate that the CIT group ( $M = 3.17, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.12, 3.23]$ ) gave significantly lower civic competence level than the ELT group ( $M = 3.35, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.31, 3.39]$ ),  $p = .000$  and the TLT group ( $M = 3.32, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.24, 3.39]$ ),  $p = .002$ .

Level of citizenship values of 4<sup>th</sup> graders was not differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 263) = 2.114, p = .099$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups also indicate that there were no significant differences across four groups.

Level of social justice values of 4<sup>th</sup> graders was differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 263) = 19.664, p = .000$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicate that the CIT group ( $M = 3.21, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.14, 3.27]$ ) gave significantly lower social justice values level than the EST group ( $M = 3.44, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.34, 3.53]$ ),  $p = .001$ , the ELT group ( $M = 3.63, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.57, 3.70]$ ),  $p = .000$ , and the TLT group ( $M = 3.43, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.32, 3.55]$ ),  $p = .001$ . The ELT group ( $M = 3.63, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.57, 3.70]$ ) also gave significantly higher social justice values level than the EST group ( $M = 3.44, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.34, 3.53]$ ),  $p = .005$ , and the TLT group ( $M = 3.43, 95\% \text{ CI } [3.32, 3.55]$ ),  $p = .004$ .

Level of participatory attitudes of 4<sup>th</sup> graders was not differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 263) = 1.965, p = .012$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups also indicate that there were no significant differences across four groups.

Level of knowledge and skills for democracy of 4<sup>th</sup> graders was differed significantly across the four groups,  $F(3, 263) = 11.809, p = .000$ . Tukey post-hoc comparisons of the four groups indicate that the CIT

group (M = 3.26, 95% CI [3.17, 3.34]) gave significantly lower knowledge and skills for democracy level than the ELT group (M = 3.58, 95% CI [3.51, 3.64]),  $p = .000$ , and the TLT group (M = 3.43, 95% CI [3.34, 3.52]),  $p = .011$ . The ELT group (M = 3.58, 95% CI [3.51, 3.64]) also gave significantly higher knowledge and skills for democracy level than the EST group (M = 3.37, 95% CI [3.28, 3.46]),  $p = .002$ .

**Table 6. t-test Results Comparing 4<sup>th</sup> Graders' Gender and Level of Civic Competence and Sub dimensions**

		Grade	n	M	SD	t	df	p																																															
Civic (OVERALL)	Competence	F	167	3,302	0,228	2,654	265	0,008																																															
		M	100	3,219	0,275				Citizenship values		F	167	3,345	0,290	1,532	265	0,127	M	100	3,285	0,347	Social justice values		F	167	3,512	0,346	5,219	265	0,000*	M	100	3,278	0,368	Participatory attitudes		F	167	2,885	0,312	-2,893	265	0,004*	M	100	3,005	0,358	Knowledge and skills for democracy	for	F	167	3,465	0,315	3,598	265
Citizenship values		F	167	3,345	0,290	1,532	265	0,127																																															
		M	100	3,285	0,347				Social justice values		F	167	3,512	0,346	5,219	265	0,000*	M	100	3,278	0,368	Participatory attitudes		F	167	2,885	0,312	-2,893	265	0,004*	M	100	3,005	0,358	Knowledge and skills for democracy	for	F	167	3,465	0,315	3,598	265	0,000*	M	100	3,309	0,390								
Social justice values		F	167	3,512	0,346	5,219	265	0,000*																																															
		M	100	3,278	0,368				Participatory attitudes		F	167	2,885	0,312	-2,893	265	0,004*	M	100	3,005	0,358	Knowledge and skills for democracy	for	F	167	3,465	0,315	3,598	265	0,000*	M	100	3,309	0,390																					
Participatory attitudes		F	167	2,885	0,312	-2,893	265	0,004*																																															
		M	100	3,005	0,358				Knowledge and skills for democracy	for	F	167	3,465	0,315	3,598	265	0,000*	M	100	3,309	0,390																																		
Knowledge and skills for democracy	for	F	167	3,465	0,315	3,598	265	0,000*																																															
		M	100	3,309	0,390																																																		

\*  $p < .05$

On average female 4<sup>th</sup> graders' overall civic competence level is higher (M = 3.30, SD = .23) than the male 4<sup>th</sup> graders (M = 3.22, SD = .28). This difference was significant;  $t(265) = 2.654$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .16$ . Level of female 4<sup>th</sup> graders' citizenship values were higher (M = 3.35, SD = .29) than the male 4<sup>th</sup> graders (M = 3.29, SD = .35). This difference was not significant;  $t(265) = 1.532$ ,  $p > .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .09$ . Level of female 4<sup>th</sup> graders' social justice values were higher (M = 3.51, SD = .35) than the male 4<sup>th</sup> graders (M = 3.28, SD = .37). This difference was significant;  $t(265) = 5.219$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a medium size effect;  $r = .31$ . Level of female 4<sup>th</sup> graders' participatory attitudes were lower (M = 2.89, SD = .31) than the male 4<sup>th</sup> graders (M = 3.01, SD = .36). This difference was significant;  $t(265) = -2.893$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .18$ . Level of female 4<sup>th</sup> graders' knowledge and skills for democracy were higher (M = 3.47, SD = .32) than the male 4<sup>th</sup> graders (M = 3.31, SD = .39). This difference was significant;  $t(265) = 3.598$ ,  $p < .05$ . This represents a small size effect;  $r = .22$ .

### Conclusions and Recommendations

On average, teacher candidates improve their civic competence level during their education. Despite the level of "citizenship values" and "participatory attitudes" is improving, level of "social justice values" and "knowledge and skills for democracy" is not improving much during the 4 years of undergraduate education. Civic competence level of teacher candidate's are not differing across departments when they started their undergraduate education (1<sup>st</sup> graders), however the difference come wider when they become seniors (4<sup>th</sup>

graders). Especially, ELT students improve their selves more than other departments' students. CIT students are the less improving group among others. Another striking point is that participatory attitudes of 1<sup>st</sup> grader female students are not differing from the 1<sup>st</sup> grader male students; however when they become to 4<sup>th</sup> grade, male students significantly differs from female students. Female students are not improving their participatory attitudes, while male students are processing.

Following recommendations could be made from the results of this study;

- In order to define why there are significant differences across departments, (especially the ELT and CIT students) not only curriculums, but also content of the courses and educational settings of the departments need to be analyzed in detail. Qualitative studies could be helpful for this purpose.
- Precaution need to be taken in order to promote and improve the participatory attitudes of female students in every department.
- Beyond the effect of departmental settings and atmosphere, other settings within the faculty need to be examined in order to explore the effect of hidden curriculum.
- Since this study is limited to transversal studies, a longitudinal study could be taken in to consideration in order to achieve more accurate results about the effect of both formal and hidden curriculums.

## References

- Barber, B. (2003). *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Brubaker, R. (1989). The French Revolution and the Invention of Citizenship. *French Politics and Society* , pp. 30-49.
- Doğanay, A. (2009). Öğretmen Adaylarının Vatandaşlık Algısı Eylemlerinin Siyasal Toplumsallaşma Bağlamında Değerlendirilmesi. *I. Uluslararası Avrupa Birliği, Demokrasi, Vatandaşlık ve Vatandaşlık Eğitimi Sempozyumu* (s. 18-35). Uşak: Uşak Üniversitesi Avrupa Birliği Eğitim, Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi.
- Doğanay, A., & Sarı, M. (2009). Lise Öğrencilerinin Vatandaşlık Algılarına Etki Eden Faktörlerin Analizi. *I. Uluslararası Avrupa Birliği, Demokrasi, Vatandaşlık ve vatandaşlık Eğitimi Sempozyumu* (pp. 36-51). Uşak: Uşak Üniversitesi Avrupa Birliği Eğitim, Araştırma ve Uygulama Merkezi.
- Education Council. (2006). Recommendation of the European Parliament and the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competencies for lifelong learning. *Official Journal of the European Union* .
- European Commission. (1998). *Education and Active Citizenship in the European Union* . Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Commission. (2012). *Turkey*. Retrieved 10 21, 2012, from European Union Enlargement: [http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/detailed-country-information/turkey/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/countries/detailed-country-information/turkey/index_en.htm)

- European Council. (2009). *Education and Training 2020 (ET 2020)*. Retrieved Ocak 28, 2012, from Summaries of EU legislation: [http://europa.eu/legislation\\_summaries/education\\_training\\_youth/general\\_framework/ef0016\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/education_training_youth/general_framework/ef0016_en.htm)
- Fraser, N., & Gordon, L. (1992). Contract versus Charity: Why is there no social citizenship in the United States? *Socialist Review* , 23 (3).
- Heater, D. (2004). *A Brief History of Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Hoskins, B. (2006). *Draft framework on indicators for Active Citizenship*. Ispra: CRELL.
- Hoskins, B., Jesinghaus, J., Mascherini, M., Munda, G., Nardo, M., Saisana, M., et al. (2008). *Measuring Active Citizenship in Europe*. Ispra: European Commission Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen.
- Hoskins, B., Jesinghaus, J., Mascherini, M., Munda, G., Nardo, N., Saisana, M., et al. (2006). *Measuring Active Citizenship Europe*. Ispra: European Commission Institute for the Protection and Security of the Citizen.
- Hoskins, B., Villalba, C., & Saisana, M. (2012). *The 2011 Civic Competence Composite Indicator (CCCI-2)*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Hoskins, B., Villalba, E., Van Nijlen, D., & Barber, C. (2008). *Measuring Civic Competence in Europe: A composite Indicator based on IEA Civic Education Study*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Ignatieff, M., & Pocock, J. (1995). The Myth of Citizenship. In R. Beiner, *Theorizing Citizenship* (pp. 29-54). Albany: University of New York.
- Insin, E., & Wood, P. (1999). *Citizenship and Identity*. London: Sage Publications.
- Jochum, V., Pratten, B., & Wilding, K. (2005). *Civil Renewal And Active Citizenship: A Guide to The Debate*.
- Jones, E., & Gaventa, J. (2002). *IDS Development Bibliography: Concepts of Citizenship: a review*. Brighton, Sussex: Institute of Development Studies.
- Kaya, A. (2005). Avrupa Birliği Bütünleşme Sürecinde Yurttaşlık, Çokkültürcülük ve Azınlık Tartışmaları: Birarada Yaşamın Siyaseti. In A. Kaya, & T. Tarhanlı, *Türkiye'de Çoğunluk ve Azınlık Politikaları: Avrupa Birliği Bütünleşme Sürecinde Yurttaşlık ve Azınlık Tartışmaları* (pp. 5-25). İstanbul: TESEV.
- Kostakopoulou, D. (1994). The Cartography of Citizenship. In D. Kostakopoulou, *The Future Governance of Citizenship*. United States and Canada: Cambridge University Press.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). Citizenship and Social Class. In T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays* (pp. 148-154). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morrison, D. (1999). Aristotle's Definition of Citizenship: A Problem and Some Solutions. *History of Philosophy Quarterly* , pp. 143-165.
- Mutz, D. (2006). *Hearing the other side: deliberative versus participatory democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oldfield, A. (1998). Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World. In G. Shafir, *The citizenship debates : a reader* (pp. 75-92). University of Minnesota Press.

- Pocock, J. (1998). The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times. In G. Shafir, *The Citizenship Debates*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota.
- Poulantzas, N. (1973). *Political Power and Social Classes*. London: New Left Books.
- Rogers, M. S. (2002). Modern Citizenship. In E. F. Işın, & B. S. Turner, *Handbook of Citizenship Studies* (pp. 89-105). London: Sage Publications.
- Skinner, Q. (1992). On Justice, the Common Good and the Priority of Liberty. In M. Chantal, *Dimensions of Radical Democracy* (pp. 211-224). London.
- Smith, A. M. (1998). *Laclau and Mouffe: The Radical Democratic Imaginary*. London: Routledge.
- Tiana, A. (2004). Developing key competencies in education systems: some lessons . In D. Rychen, & A. Tiana, *Developing key competencies in education: some lessons form international and national experiences*. Geneva: UNESCO-International Bureau of Education.
- Turner, B. S. (1993). *Citizenship and Social Theory*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Verba, S., & Nie, H. (1972). *Participation in America: Political Democracy And Social Equality*. New York: Harper and Row.