



Future Citizenship, Democracy and Human Rights Education with Creative Drama and Other Interactive Teaching Methods *

Özgür Ulubey ¹, Fatma Dilek Gözütok ²

Abstract

In this study, by using Citizenship and Democracy Education Curricula (CDEC) with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods, it was aimed to determine the academic achievement of students, their commitment to democratic values, the reasons of successful student's being successful, and suggest a program for the future education. The study, utilized experimental embedded design, which is one of the mixed method designs, It was conducted with 80 students (Experiment: 30; Control 1: 28, Control 2: 22) in secondary school, which is under the aegis of Çankaya District National Education Directorate. Data was gathered with "Primary School Citizenship and Democracy Education Course Achievement Test", "The Scale of Commitment to Democratic Values", and "Semi-Structured Interview Form"; data was analyzed by using "Content Analysis" with "Two Factor Anova for Mixed Measures", "Wilcoxon Signed Ranks" and "Mann Withney U" tests. As a result of the study, it is determined that CDEC, which is richened with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods, increases the achievement of students meaningfully, and creates a commitment to democratic values among students. The program is suggested to be used in future citizenship, democracy, and human rights education.

Keywords

Citizenship and democracy education curricula
Creative drama
Other interactive teaching methods
Programme evaluation

Article Info

Received: 25.06.2015
Accepted: 27.11.2015
Online Published: 16.01.2016

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2015.4845

Introduction

In societies, which are governed by democracy, it is expected from citizens to know their duties and responsibilities, embrace the democracy, individual rights and freedoms, and make them a lifestyle. For this reason, governments aim to raise individuals, who fulfill their responsibilities, have democratic values, and protect their rights and freedoms, by educating them on citizenship, democracy, and human rights.

Citizenship education is defined as the attendance of individuals to decision making processes as active, and responsible citizens (Hébert and Sears, 2001); by developing a knowledge, an ability, and an attitude about citizenship (Banks, 2004; Davis, 1994), by being prepared for their roles as a citizen

* This research was driven from doctoral dissertation titled The Effect of The Implementation of Citizenship And Democracy Education Curriculum With Creative Drama and Other Interactive Teaching Methods on Academic Achievement And Loyalty To Democratic Values. This study was presented at International Congress on Education for the Future: Issues and Challenges.

¹ Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Turkey, ozgurulubey@gmail.com

² Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences, Department of Curriculum, Turkey, dgozutok@ankara.edu.tr

during the education process (Kerr, 1999). Citizenship education has aims such as creating a collective identity, deepening their love of country, nation and their commitment (Scott and Lowson, 2002), teaching individuals the rights and responsibilities, outmaneuvering of the law, protecting and improving the democracy (Council of Europe, 2010), raising individuals who are democrats in social, cultural, economic, and politic life (Crick, 2000).

For Citizenship education to achieve its purposes, students should have knowledge about social subjects (Guérin, Ploeg and Sins, 2013); take an active part at the local, national, and international level; learn their rights and responsibilities, economy, and democratic institutions; and be respectful to different national, religious, and ethnic identities (DfEE, 1999). After this, they should be raised as active and responsible individuals who attend the decision making processes (Naval, Print and Veldhuis, 2002; Schulz, Fraillon and Ainley, 2011). Students should be taught both in and out of the classroom how to use the knowledge, ability and values about serving the public and participating in social life. They should gain concepts such as respect to law, justice, and freedom of thought (Crick, 1998). Under present conditions, there seems to be a need for giving citizenship education together with democracy education. Since social, economic, cultural, and politic attendance can be mentioned only in a democratic environment, teaching of both concepts can be easier.

Democracy education “is the education which cherishes the value and integrity of student as an individual, working together, mutual respect and personality, in teacher-learner relationships and educational activities at every stage of education” (Oğuzkan, 1981, p. 46). With the democracy education, it is aimed to raise citizens who display a democratic behavior, embrace and defend human rights and freedoms, know their place in front of laws, fulfill their responsibilities to society and law (Gülmez, 2001; Güven, 2011), and embrace democratic values. Hence, an education, which begins at home, continues at school and in society, should be provided for children.

Schools should be transformed into places in which students can learn democracy through experience, and in which democratic principles dominate (Kuzgun, 2000). At schools, students should develop democratic attitudes and behaviors (Doğanay, 2010), and they should be made feel that they are important members of the society (Maitles and GilChrist, 2006). Among all the individuals at school, respectful, forgiving, equal, fair, solidarist, peaceful relationships should be established (Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2000; Levin, 1998). “Participation” principle should be implemented in the school environment, too. Teachers, students, and families should participate in the decision making process about school (Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2003).

“Democracy and human rights are essential requirements for each other. The level of development and protection of democracy and human rights in a country, is the sign of democracy in that country” (Gözütok, 2011, p. 321). Democracy can be maintained by protecting the human rights and by showing respect to those rights. United Nations (UN) and UNESCO both stated democracy education is a human right at The International Congress of Human Rights and Democracy Education in Montreal, Canada, in 1993, and Malta and Vienna Congresses (Gülmez, 2001).

Human rights education is generally defined as extensification, informing, educating and teaching attempts which aim to construct human rights as a global culture (Flowers, 2000; Rasmussen, 2012; UN, 1996; UNESCO, 2012), and as the education that is given with the purpose of individual’s knowing, using, protecting, and developing their rights (Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2008). Human rights education, is an international movement which aims to raise awareness about the process of annihilating the violations with Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and with other human rights conventions (Reardon, 1995; Tibbitts, 1996 cited as Tibbitts, 2008).

Within human rights education, national, regional, and international human rights systems and basic human rights should be taught (Rasmussen, 2012). Factors preventing the protection and comprehension of human rights should be eliminated, and students should synthesize universal values and national values, and evaluate the standards about human rights (Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2000). Activities in human rights should focus on the principles of human rights such as equality in their own

cultural context, not discriminating, supremacy of law, and it should be related to real life experiences of the learners (UNESCO, 2012). In human rights education, individuals should acquire skills like empathizing, effective listening, communication, critical thinking, collaborating in group works and working out the conflicts in a positive way, building consensus, participating democratically to activities with peers, self-expression with confidence, and problem solving (Brander, Gomes, Keen, Lemineur, Oliveira, Ondrackova, Surian and Suslova, 2008; Flowers, 2010; Martin, 1996; Rasmussen, 2012).

Basic indicators of modern democracy understanding are recognition, protection, and use of human rights and freedoms. Individuals should be raised as active citizens who know and embrace their rights and freedoms, respect the rights and freedoms of others, and turn democracy into a lifestyle. Because of that, democracy and human rights education should be given together. Since the founding of the Turkish Republic, CDEC and the similar ones were included in primary school programs with various names as a course. In 1924 Primary School Programme, the name of the lesson was “Malumat-ı Vataniye” (Knowledge of Homeland). In 1926 and 1936 Primary School Programme, it was changed to “Civics”(Knowledge of Country), and there were four hours of the lesson for fourth grade, and there was one hour for fifth grade (MEB, 1930, 1936). Civics course was named as “Knowledge of Citizenship / Civics” in 1948 Primary School Programme (MEB, 1957). In the 1968 Primary School Programme, “Knowledge of Citizenship” was included to “Social Studies” (MEB, 1968). The name of this lesson was changed to “Citizenship Knowledge” after 1980 (Çiftçi, 2008). After the year 1995, human rights dimension was added to this course, and the name of it was changed to “Citizenship and Human Rights Education”. In 1995-1996 Academic Year, the lesson was taught in eighth grade classes, and in 1997-1998 Academic Year, it was taught in eighth and seventh grade classes for an hour per week (MEB, 1995, 2003). In 2005 Primary School Programme, a lesson named as human rights, citizenship, and democracy education was not included. Instead of this, it was included to other courses under the name of “Human Rights and Citizenship”, and “interdisciplinary” approach was used (ERG, 2005). Having been accepted in 2010, CDEC was piloted in 2010–2011 academic year on 8th grade students, and it became a compulsory course in 2011–2012 academic year. In “CDEC” there are four themes: “Every human is precious”, “Democracy culture”, “Our rights and freedoms” and “Our duties and responsibilities” (MEB, 2010). It can be said that the program aims to introduce basic concepts on democracy culture, citizenship, human rights and freedoms to students; to create awareness, sensibility, and opinion, and to develop behaviors in relation to these concepts. After 2015-2016 Academic Year, the name and content of CDEC were changed, and it was started to be implemented as Primary School Human Rights, Citizenship, and Democracy Curriculum in the fourth grade (MEB, 2015).

Studies show that citizenship, democracy, and human rights education which takes place in the programme by various names generally do not achieve their purposes (Arıkan, 2002; Güdücü, 2008; Güven, 2010; İnan, 2005; Kıvanç, 2003; Toraman, 2012; Uyangör, 2007). As a reason of this, learning and teaching environments’ not being arranged in a way that students can be active, using methods such as question-answer, debate, and narration are shown (Arıkan, 2002; Aydeniz, 2010; Candan, 2006; Çıplak, 2002; Dolanbay, 2011; Güdücü, 2008; Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2005; Kıvanç, 2003; Özbek, 2004; Topper, 2007; Ulubey, Koçer and Toraman, 2013; Uyangör, 2007). It is seen that studies in literature are generally descriptive, there are not enough experimental studies, which can get courses achieve their goals, and there is a need for studies using new methods and techniques.

Besides the fact Citizenship, Democracy and Human Rights Education courses in primary school programs do not achieve their goals, it can be said that there is also a problem about embracing democratic values. Embracing democratic values was also an important problem in Western countries in which democracy has been practiced for so many years. The studies conducted in these countries showed that even university students do not have democratic values (Özbudun, 1989). For individuals to gain values related to democracy, their attitudes which are not suitable for democracy should be corrected (Başaran, 2007; Büyükkaragöz, 1990). Therefore, to raise children in accordance with the democratic values, they should acquire the skills, attitudes, and knowledge related to democracy (Farrel, 1998; Lister,

1982; Selvi, 2011). While literature does not have experimental studies, with the aim of improving the loyalty of students to democratic values, there are some studies, which were conducted for determining loyalty of primary school students to democratic values (Doğanay and Sarı, 2004; Sarı, 2007; Sarı, Sarı and Ötünç, 2008).

It does not seem possible for a society to improve economically, culturally, and socially when individuals in the society are unaware of their duties as citizens and the duties of government, fail to participate in the local, national, and international decision-making mechanisms actively, do not embrace democratic values such as equality, freedom, and justice, neither use human rights and freedoms, nor show respect to rights and freedoms of others. Hence; there is a need for an education, which prepares individuals for future on subjects of citizenship, democracy, and human rights. This kind of an education is possible with a teacher training, which is appropriate for the necessities of the time, and reforming of training programs. When prudential studies are examined in literature, it is seen that there is an emphasis on teacher training, and the change of training programs. For example; Darling-Hammond (2010), dwells on the necessity of making teacher training suitable for raising future individuals. Apart from that, it is seen that there are studies on engineering (Peigen, 2010; Rugarcia, Felder, Woods and Stice, 2000), science (Boyer and Mitgang, 1996; Hodson, 2003; Millar and Osborne, 1998), architecture (Boyer and Mitgang, 1996), citizenship (Gutman, 1993), and parental education (Schaefer, 1991). Besides teacher training, and studies of formatting future education in some areas, how future training programs should be for becoming a knowledge based society is a subject that is dwelled on (Young, 2010). Citizenship and Democracy Education Programme prepared as part of this study, is one of the programs prepared in the scope of future education. In the programme, it is thought that future individuals, who know their responsibilities as citizens, believe in and defend democratic values, use their rights and freedoms, can be raised by using creative drama and other interactive teaching methods.

In this study, it is thought that the goals of CDEC can be achieved, and students can embrace democratic values by using other interactive teaching methods such as station, brain storming, case study, speaking ring, thinking hats, big or small group discussion, question and answer, and mainly creative drama.

Creative drama method, which is mainly used in this study, can establish a ground for the improvement of social abilities which are essential in democratic process by creating a learning through experience environment. Thanks to the interaction among groups' being in the forefront, student can learn deciding together and acting together through experience (Karadağ and Çalışkan, 2005). Creative drama method can lead them to respect to human rights and freedoms, gain the democratic values like conciliation, toleration, equality, freedom, and participation. Students can realize the morals, and values they have. By assessing incompatible situations, they can compare by revealing their positive ways that can lead to a solution. By having ideas about situations, events, and people they can connect between cause and effect of situations, and make an inference. Real life is brought to the classroom environment, thus they can improve their self-expression by observing. They can learn to respect the ones that are different from them, and they can also learn how to start a common action (Ermiş and Ermiş, 2009). Individuals can gain democratic values easily during the drama process by experiencing.

Using creative drama and other interactive teaching methods in Citizenship and Democracy Education Course (CDEL) can get students to attend courses effectively, and get them realize the violations of democracy and human rights. They can learn human rights and freedoms, concepts on citizenship and democracy, the responsibilities of individual and government by practicing. Besides activities used in the course can increase achievement of the students and their commitment to democratic values significantly. Creativity, imagination, and metacognitive abilities of students such as understanding, interpretation, and being aware of the things learned can improve. Their desire about the course and learning can increase. Students can learn abstract concepts, such as democracy, freedom, equality, and justice easily.

Because of the reasons above, there occurred a necessity of implementing CDEC activities enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods, and assessing the programme with target driven programme assessment model to determine whether it is successful or not. Thus, it is thought that an effective programme, which can be used in future citizenship, democracy, human rights education, can be formed.

In this study, academic achievement of the students, their commitment to democratic values as a result of CDEC application with the use of creative drama and other interactive teaching methods, and also determination of reasons behind the achievements of successful students and offering programs to them for future education were aimed. Within the direction of this aim, the answers of the questions below were searched.

Is there a meaningful difference among the pre-test – post-test points that the students in Experimental, Control 1 and Control 2 groups got from primary school Citizenship and Democracy Education Course Achievement Test?

1. Is there a meaningful difference between pre-test – post-test points that the students in Experimental, Control 1 and Control 2 groups got from The Scale of Students' Commitment to Democratic Values?
2. What are the reasons behind the achievement of the successful students?
3. How should the future citizenship, democracy and human rights education be?

Method

Research Design

In this study experimental embedded design, which is one of the mixed method designs, was used. This pattern can be used for answering secondary research question in experimental studies. In experimental studies, the researcher can put qualitative data into quantitative data to test experiment process and explain the responses of the participants about their participation in the experiment. In this pattern, qualitative and quantitative data can be accumulated simultaneously or sequentially (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2014). In this study experimental embedded design was used to specify the efficiency of programme applied to the experiment group and explain the achievements of the students in the experiment group in a better way. Qualitative and quantitative data were interpreted together at the end of the research process.

Study Group

With the aim of determination of qualitative group of the research, at the beginning of 2012-2013 fall academic year, Primary School Citizenship and Democracy Education Achievement Test (PSCDEAT) was applied to the students of 8/A, 8/B and 8/C classes of in secondary school affiliated with Ankara provincial directorate of national education. The data obtained from this application were analyzed with ANOVA and a meaningful difference was not found among these three groups. The results showed that three classes were equal to each other (0,470; $p > 0.05$). There was a ballot among the groups whose arithmetic mean was the closest and the values in 8/C experimental group ($X=21.70$), 8/A control group 1 ($X=19.89$) and 8/B control group 2 ($X=16.77$) were specified like this. There were 30 students in experimental group, 28 students in control 1 group and 22 students in control 2 group. 18 of the students in experimental group were girls, and 12 of them were boys. 18 of the students in control 1 group were girls, and 10 of them were boys. 12 of the students in control 2 group were girls, and 10 of them were boys. According to the number of individuals in the family, graduation degrees of parents, it can be said that these students were from similar environments.

After the data, obtained from the application at the beginning and the end of the research in experimental, control 1 and control 2 groups, were analyzed; it was determined that the points in experimental group were higher. It was aimed that this situation would be searched in a depth analysis. The 30 students in the experimental group comprised qualitative group of the research. With 6 of these students, trial application was conducted. The remaining 24 students divided into three groups, and focus group discussion was conducted. 16 of these students were girls, and 8 of them were boys.

Data Collection Tools

With the aim of determination of CDEC's reach to its outcomes, PSCDEAT, developed by Toraman (2012), was used. The achievement test comprised of open ended questions and they were graded with grading key. In the test, there were 8 reading passages, which evaluate 32 attainments in CDEC, and 36 open ended questions. Expert opinion was received to prove the validity of the success test. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the success test was found as 0.90.

With the aim of finding whether the difference among pre-test – post-test points that the students in experimental and control groups got from SCDV is meaningful or not, SCDV, developed by Doğanay and Sari (2004) for primary school 8th grades, was used. Trial was conducted to find whether the key is appropriate for 8th grade students that took CDEL. At the end of exploratory factor analysis, factor load values of the scale was found between 0.49 – 0.81 for factor 1 and 0.48 – 0.61 for factor 2. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found as 0.90. The researcher that developed the scale found that SCDV comprised of two sub scales and positive items were in the first sub scale and negative items were in the second sub scale. Positive and negative items accumulated in two sub scales measured democratic values attainment level as a whole and it was evaluated that the data would be presented in a better way. The scale, which was prepared by combining sub dimensions and comprised of 25 items, was named as SCDV. The scale was used as a single dimension in this study. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the first factor of the scale, which consists of total 25 items, was found as 0.93, the second factor was found as 0.76, and all of them was found as 0.90. The contribution of factors to total variance was %44, 15. Analyses were made according to total points of the scale in this study.

With the aim of determining the reasons behind the achievements of students of experimental group, "Semi-structured Interview Form", which was developed by the researcher, was used. With the questions in interview form, it was aimed that the reasons behind the achievements of the students in experimental group would be specified. Apart from the questions in the interview form, additional questions were asked according to the answers that they gave during the interview. Six question interview form, which was prepared in accordance with the purpose of the study, was presented to two qualitative research, two human rights, two democracy education, and three programme development experts before the trial application. In accordance with the feedbacks from the experts, the number questions were increased to seven, and incoherencies and spelling errors were corrected. After the corrections, the form was applied to six people chosen from the experimental group for trial. During the application, it was found out that one question is not clear enough. So this question was corrected, and the form was put into its final form. According to the answers received from students, questions were restructured, and the form was put into its final form.

Citizenship and Democracy Education Curricula Applied to Experimental and Control Group

To prepare the program applied to experimental group, CDEC, developed by the ministry of education, was examined. Firstly, contents suitable for acquisitions were prepared. It was paid attention for content to be similar to lives of students, to improve skills such as creativity, problem solving, and critical thinking. Learning teaching process in accordance with the content was formed. Learning-teaching process was enriched by interactive teaching methods and techniques like creative drama, station, brain storming, case study, speaking ring, thinking hats, big or small group discussion, question and answer. Then, relevant assessment and evaluation instrument was chosen. These instruments are open ended questions, self-assessment forms, observation forms and grading keys prepared by the researcher, and brochures, stories, essays, letters, wall newspaper, posters prepared by students. Prepared programme was presented to two program development experts, two creative drama experts, two assessment and evaluation experts and one Turkish expert. Within the direction of replies coming from the experts, the program took its final position with the arrangements.

CDEC, which was prepared by the Ministry of National Education with an approach including multiple intelligence theory, student centered, activity based, was applied to control groups. It was stated in the programme that the aim is to teach basic concepts related to citizenship, democracy, and human rights to students. It was also stated that students are expected to structure and transform the

knowledge by themselves. It was expressed that it is aimed for students to acquire skill and values through activities and acquisitions. In the programme, besides eight skills that were expected to be gained by students during primary and secondary school lessons, other skills were also aimed to be acquired. Lessons of control 1 group were conducted by the researcher, and lessons of control 2 group were conducted by the teacher of the lesson. All anticipated activities were done with students during the programme.

Data Collection and Research Process

At the first week of 2012-2013 academic year, PSCDEAT and SCDV were applied to the students of 8/A, 8/B and 8/C classes. The findings were used for determining the experimental and control. The applications started at the third week of academic year. CDEL enriched by creative drama and other interactive methods, was applied to experimental group by the researcher and CDEC, developed by the ministry of education, was applied to control group by the researcher for 28 weeks. Lessons of experimental and control 1 groups were conducted by the researcher, who is an expert in creative drama and interactive teaching methods, and lessons of control 2 group were conducted by the teacher of the lesson. Creative drama and interactive teaching methods were used in experimental group, and all activities were used in control 1 and 2 groups. Control 2 group was included to control the teacher effect.

After programs were applied, PSCDEAT and SCDV were given to three groups again. With the completion of experimental operation, the students in experimental group obtained higher points from PSCDEAT. With the aim of examining the reasons of this situation, the students of experimental group were interviewed. The interviews lasted for 40, 61 and 83 minutes. Before starting the interview process, it was told to students that having an interview with them was required, and they were asked if they are volunteers or not for the interview. All of the students volunteered. Thereupon, permissions were received from their families, and it was decided to have interviews with all of the students in experimental group. Interviews were made in 41, 61, and 83 minutes by using focus group method eight-people in three groups in the meeting room at the school. Interviews were recorded. After this, sound recordings were computerized with code names given to participants. Interviews were deciphered by giving code names to interviewed students such as K1, K2, K3. Quotes used in the scope of the research were given with code names, and the identities of students were kept anonymous. Besides the data gathered were not used outside the scope of the study.

Data Analysis

PSCDEAT was applied to the students in experimental and control groups at the beginning and end of the research. The students' responses to the questions, were read by the researcher, CDEL teacher and the expert who developed assessment instrument and they were graded in accordance with the criteria in the grading key. To determine the reliability among three experts' grading, Krippendorff Alpha reliability coefficient tests were used. Reliability of Krippendorff Alpha coding was found as 0.95 for pre-test and as 0.98 for post-test. According to Krippendorff (2004), the value of 0,80 and over shows good fit among coders. "Two Factors ANOVA for Mixed Computation" was used for the data obtained from achievement test. "Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test" and "Mann Withney U Test" from nonparametric tests were used in the analysis of SCDV. In the analysis of DDBO, it was anticipated to use "Two Factor Anova for Mixed Measures". However; the requirements could not be met for it. Therefore "Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test" and "Mann Withney U Test" from nonparametric tests were used.

The data obtained from focus group discussion with the students in experimental group were analyzed with content analysis. The data were read several times to obtain general overview for content analysis and they were coded in two cycles. In the first cycle, the data were divided into meaningful sections as open, in vivo and descriptive coding. The conceptual meaning explained by each section was sought. Then the second coding cycle was conducted. In this stage, the codes formed in the first cycle formed categories with pattern and axis coding. By combining categories together, they were themed. Then, the themes were interpreted by explaining the codes under the themes and their relationships with each other and cause and effect relationship was examined by giving direct quotations.

Validity and Reliability for Qualitative Data

To provide validity and reliability for the research; credibility, transferability, controllability and confirmability were examined. Strategies like triangulation, long term interaction, researcher stance, expert examination and participant confirmation were offered to provide reliability and validity for the research (Linkoln and Guba, 1985; Meriam, 2009; Patton, 2014). In the research, the data were obtained from students by using PSCDEAT, SCDV and semi-structured interview form as a requirement of triangulation strategy in accumulation of the data, and credibility of the research was tried to be increased by examining the relationships of findings in accordance with the data obtained from students. Having long term interaction with students (28 weeks) removed the problems appearing as a result of presence of the researcher during the interview and persuasiveness of the research increased. The other method, expert examination was conducted to provide credibility of the research. The meeting was held about qualitative research methods and the researcher orally transferred all processes to the expert. Then, obtained data and results were shared with the expert and approach of the researcher and validity of the way of thinking were evaluated with the expert. The expert asked about research process, examined raw data and replied about suitability of these processes.

Strategies like detailed description and sample selection can be used to provide transferability in qualitative research (Meriam, 2009). In this research, the data, obtained through the interview while the findings were being presented, were examined without making any comment and the themes, formed as result of data analysis, were often supported by direct quotations to provide transferability of the research. The other way of providing transferability is to conduct sample selection carefully and meticulously. All of the students in experimental group were interviewed in the research.

It is offered that the qualities of participants, who are the source of data, should be specified in details, conceptual framework should be described from data analysis and data obtaining process and detailed explanation of analysis should be conducted to provide confirmability in qualitative research (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2013). When “method” and “findings” sections of the study were structured, mentioned items above were described in details.

Results

The findings were found within the direction of the research’s sub aims.

The findings related to comparison of pre-test – post-test points that the students of experimental, control 1 and control 2 groups got from PSCDEAT.

Average point and standard deviation values that the students of experimental, control 1 and control 2 got from PSCDEAT are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Average Points and Standard Deviation Values That the Students of Experimental, Control 1 and Control 2 Got from PSCDEAT

Groups	Measuring	N	\bar{X}	S
Experimental	Pretest	30	21.70	7.39
	Posttest	30	52.57	10.33
Control 1	Pretest	28	19.89	6.61
	Posttest	28	29.04	11.11
Control 2	Pretest	22	16.77	6.66
	Posttest	22	17.64	7.97

As seen in Table 1, while achievement test average points of students in experimental group before the experiment were 21.70 with the application of CDEC, enriched by creative drama and other interactive teaching methods, average points after the experiment were 52.57. While achievement test average points of students in control 1 group before application were 19.89, with the application of CDEC, developed by the ministry of education, the average points were 29.04 after application. While achievement test average points of students in control 2 before application were 16.77, the average

points were 17.64 after application. These findings show that there is an increase in the achievements of students in all three groups but the increase in experimental groups is higher than the increase in control groups.

Two-factors ANOVA results, whether the change observed before and after the experiment shows a meaningful difference or not in the achievements of students in experimental and control 1 groups, are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Two-factors ANOVA Results Related to Pre-test – Pro-test Points of Students in Experimental and Control 1 Groups

Source of Variance	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	d
Intergroup	12519.724	57				
Group (Experimental/Control 1)	4649.104	1	4649.104	781.94	.000	
Error	7870.862	56	140.551			
Intra-groups	16335.553	58				
Measuring (Pretest-Posttest)	11591.725	1	11591.725	489.38	.000	2.19
Group*Measuring	3417.380	1	3417.380	144.27	.000	
Error	1326.448	56	23.687			
Total	28855.277	115				

When group factor is taken as a basis in Table 2, there is a meaningful difference between students in experimental and control 1 [(F(1;56): 781.94, p<.05)]. This finding shows that achievement points of students in experimental and control 1 groups differ before and after the experiment (pre-test – post-test) without making any distinctions. Also, there is a meaningful difference among pre-test – post-test average achievement points of students [(F(1,56): 489.38, p<0.05)]. According to this finding, when group distinction isn't made (experimental-control), it can be said that the achievements of students change in accordance with applied program.

The factors, showing pre-test – post-test computation with being in experimental and control 1 groups, have a meaningful effect on achievements of students. [(F(1,56): 144.27, p<0.05)]. This finding means that the change observed in achievements of students in experimental group, for whom the program enriched by creative drama and other interactive teaching methods were applied, is different than the change observed in achievements of students in control 1 group. In other words, achievements of students increase as a result of experimental operation. It can be stated that the change in students' average achievement point stems from the program, enriched by creative drama and other interactive teaching methods and the program, and enriched by the researcher is more influential than activity-based program, developed by ministry of education in terms of increasing achievements of students. In this analysis, Cohen's influence quantity coefficient was found as d=2.19. This value is high according to Cohen (1988).

Two-factors of ANOVA results related to whether students in control groups show a meaningful difference or not about the achievements in CDEC are given in Table 3.

Table 3. ANOVA Results Related to Pre-test – Pro-test Points of Students from PSCDEAT in Control 1 and Control 2 Groups

Source of Variance	KT	Sd	KO	F	p	d
Intergroup	6707.21	49				
Group (Control 1 / Control 2)	1298.622	1	1298.622	11.52	.001	
Error	5408.588	48	112.679			
Intra-groups	2415.05	50				
Measuring (Pretest-Posttest)	616.800	1	616.800	21.51	.000	1.79
Group*Measuring	422.240	1	422.240	14.72	.000	
Error	1376.010	48	28.667			
Total	8083.22	99				

When Table 3 is evaluated and group factor is taken as a basis, it is found that there is a meaningful difference between control 1 and control 2 groups on achievement [(F(1,48): 11.52, $p < 0.05$)]. Also, there is a meaningful difference among pre-test – post-test average achievement points of students [(F(1,48): 21.51, $p < 0.05$)].

The factors, showing pre-test – post-test computation with control 1 and control 2 groups, have a meaningful effect on achievements of students. [(F(1,48): 14.72, $p < 0.05$)]. This finding means that the change observed in achievements of students in control 1 group, whose courses were taught by the researcher, is higher than the change observed in achievements of students in control 2 group, whose courses were taught by CDEL. This situation can show that there is not a non-objective evaluation. In this analysis, Cohen's influence quantity coefficient was found as $d=1.73$. This value is high according to Cohen (1988).

The findings related to comparison of pre-test – post-test points that the students of experimental, control 1 and control 2 groups got from PSCDEAT.

Average point and standard deviation values that the students of experimental, and control 1 got from PSCDEAT are shown in Table 4.

Table 4. Comparison of Experimental and Control 1 Group Students' Pre-test Post-test Results They Got from SCDV

Measuring	Groups	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	P
Pretest	Experimental	30	31.65	949.50	355.50	.315
	Control 1	28	27.20	761.50		
Posttest	Experimental	30	41.72	1251.0	53.500	.000
	Control 1	28	16.41	459.50		

According to Table 4, there is not a meaningful difference between experimental and Control 1 group's results in SCDV before the experiment ($U= 355.50$, $p > 0.05$), However, in post-test there is a meaningful difference and it is positive for experimental group ($U= 53.500$, $p < 0.05$). The SCDV points of Experimental group's pretest-posttest are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Comparison of Experimental and Control 1 Group Students' Pre-test Post-test Results They Got from SCDV

Groups	Posttest-Pretest	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	z	p
Experimental Group	Negative Rank	4 ^a	9.63	38.50	3.749	.000
	Positive Rank	24 ^b	15.31	367.50		
	Equal	2 ^c				
Control 1 Group	Negative Rank	9 ^a	16.83	151.50	.901	.367
	Positive Rank	18 ^b	12.58	226.50		
	Equal	1 ^c				

a. Posttest < Pretest b. Posttest > Pretest c. Posttest = Pretest

While the findings in Table 5 show a meaningful difference between pretest and posttest points that the experimental group got from SCDV ($z= 3.749$, $p < 0.05$), it is seen that there is not a meaningful difference between the points of Control 1 group students ($z= .901$, $p > 0.05$).

Points that the students of control 1 and control 2 got from SCDV are given in Table 6.

Table 6. Comparison of Control 1 and Control 2 Group Students' Pre-test Post-test Results They Got from SCDV

Measuring	Group	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	U	p
Pretest	Control 1	28	26.16	732.50	289.500	.717
	Control 2	22	24.16	542.50		
Posttest	Control 1	28	26.68	747.00	275.000	.518
	Control 2	22	24.00	528.00		

According to Table 6, there is not a meaningful difference between the points that control 1 and control 2 students got from SCDV before the experiment ($U=289.500$, $p>0.05$) and after the experiment ($U=275.000$, $p>0.05$).

Points that the students of control 1 and control 2 got from SCDV are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Comparison of Control 1 and Control 2 Group Students' Pre-test Post-test Results They Got from SCDV

Groups	Posttest-Pretest	N	Mean Rank	Rank Sum	z	p
Control 1 Group	Negative Rank	9 ^a	16.83	151.50	.901	.367
	Positive Rank	18 ^b	12.58	226.50		
	Equal	1 ^c				
Control 2 Group	Negative Rank	7 ^a	12.71	89.00	1.218	.223
	Positive Rank	15 ^b	10.93	164.00		
	Equal	0 ^c				

a. Posttest < Pretest b. Posttest > Pretest c. Posttest = Pretest

The findings in Table 7 show that there is not a meaningful difference between the points of pretest and posttest in SCDV got by the students of control 1 ($z=.901$, $p>0.05$) and control 2 ($z=1.218$, $p>0.05$). According to the findings of research, it is thought that VDEDP which was developed by the Ministry of National Education is not effective in creating a commitment for democratic values in students. It can be said that it is hard to change the commitment and behavior of students during courses in which students are not an active part of learning process.

Findings Related to the Reasons Why the Students in Successful Group are Successful

During the research, it was found out that the increase in experimental group students' achievement is meaningfully different from the control group students'. The interview results on the reasons of experimental group students' achievement are given in Table 8.

Table 8. Opinions of the Students in the Experiment Group Regarding Activities

Themes	f
Features of Activities	165
Its Contribution to Learning	15
Facilitating learning	11
Enabling to learn by experiencing	2
Enabling to learn content better	1
Enabling to remember easily	1
Positive Features of Activities	76
Being fun	24
Being interesting	24
Enabling participation to course	21
Being instructional	5
Being educational	1
Preparing for life	1
Its Contribution to the Individual's Development	74
Its Contribution to the Individual's Cognitive Development	54
Its Contribution to Skill Development	45
Improving Empathy	23
Developing self-expression skill	22
Its Contribution to Thinking Skill Development	1
Facilitate thinking	1
Its Contribution to High Level Thinking Skill Development	5
Developing creativity	4
Developing imagination	1
Its Contribution to Metacognitive Skill Development	3
Enabling sense making	1
Enabling to realize understanding	1
Being aware of learning	1
Its Contribution to the Individual's Sensory Development	10
Increasing confidence	4
Increasing sense of responsibility	3
Developing a positive attitude towards environment	1
Creating a positive attitude towards course	1
Creating awareness relating to events	1
Its Contribution to Affective Development Relating to Learning	2
Increasing belief towards learning	1
Increasing enthusiasm towards learning	1
Its Contribution to Peer Interaction	5
Sharing tasks	3
Being pleased with sharing tasks	1
Enabling cooperation in group studies	1
Highlights Related to the Learning Environment	3
Teaching in a different and suitable environment	2
Not a suitable teaching environment	1

According to Table 8, in which students in the experiment group stated that activities facilitated their learning (f=11), they learned the course content better by experiencing (f=2) and the subjects they learned during course were remembered easily for a longer time (f=1). Students' expressions relating to these findings are given below:

K1: It was very interesting and fun to learn by doing drama, not by reading. I think it made learning easier for us.

K11: It was different from all other classes. For example, it made us to learn easier by doing instead of listening to the teachers in other classes.

K13: Doing drama and discussing course are more fun, and helped us to learn easily.

K3: I think that creative drama affects us very positively. On the one side, we can open a book and read it. But on the other side, we can do it with drama and develop ourselves.

K16: We could remember easier the subjects we already see in our lives because we have understood them with drama. When we read them in classes, we cannot remember well. However, we can remember the subject taught in drama classes.

According to the opinions of students, creative drama and other interactive teaching methods used in CDEL enabled students to attend physically to the studies, learn the course content easily by experiencing, having fun and being pleased, and remember the information they learn for a long time. Considering the opinions of students, it can be determined that creative drama and other interactive teaching methods help effective and permanent learning.

Students stated that activities affected them in a positive way. They expressed that they found activities fun (f=24) and interesting (f=24), they attended the classes due to activities (f=21), classes were more instructional (f=5) and educational (f=1), and helped them prepare for life. Expressions of students relating to these findings are given below:

K7: It was very fun. I had really good time during dramas and station method.

K19: Many of us were enthusiastic because class was very good and fun. We were interested in what we would do this week and what would happen in drama. It was good for me.

K17: It was interesting because we used a method we had never used before. It was more fun to try to understand the subject all together instead of sitting on the desks and listening to someone.

K9: As far as I've seen, everyone was excited when we would do drama. That's why this method increases participation.

K18: I think activities were very instructional because we were doing drama in 5 minutes and playing it. We had station method. We continued other groups' tasks. We were trying to be creative. We were playing some instructional games.

K8: The class was very good. It prepared us for real life. We discussed the issues about life while we were playing games. Six thinking hats method was really good.

Sharing tasks during activities, expressing their opinions freely, preparing for subjects by playing games at the beginning of classes helped students to learn subjects by having fun; subjects about daily life, activities close to real life, teaching content with games, using a new method in class, attending by experiencing helped the classes to be more interesting. Students stated that class activities, plays, group studies and games helped them to participate to the classes, they were excited about classes due to creative drama and other interactive teaching methods and they wanted the same methods to be used also in other classes. Furthermore, students' opinions show that class activities, plays and other methods are educational and instructional, and they prepare students for real life. Considering these findings, it can be said that activities using CDEL make classes fun and interesting, and prepare students for life and enable them to attend classes. Students determined that class activities improve their empathy (23) and self-expression (22) skills. Students' expressions relating to these findings are given below:

K3: For example, we placed ourselves in their shoes while trying to solve issues that you provided us. What did they live and why did they behave like that? How did the issue come up? It affected my empathy skill positively.

K11: Firstly, drama was very effective because we were on a stage and in front of people. We were either ashamed or shy. But due to these activities, we started to express ourselves.

Students could show empathy by feeling others' feelings while finding solutions for the issues given during activities and playing someone's role. Moreover, students could express themselves while playing games during preparation and warm-up, and while enacting during a role-play and evaluating class during evaluation phase. Thus, it can be stated that CDEL enriched with creative drama and other interactive methods can develop students' empathy and self-expression skills.

CDEL enriched with creative drama and other interactive methods developed students' thinking skills (f=1), creativity (f=4) and imagination (f=1). Students' expressions relating to these findings are given below:

K18: I think activities were very instructional because we were doing drama in 5 minutes and playing it. We had station method. We continued other groups' tasks. We were trying to be creative.

K22: We did these activities and I was very pleased. We developed our imagination. We wrote stories and finished them in a short time.

Students stated that creative drama method, writing stories in a short time, impersonating by completing the stories and cases given them helped developing their creativity, imagination and thinking skills.

Students expressed that during CDEL enriched with creative drama and other interactive methods; they can understand the subjects (f=1), make sense (f=1) and be aware of learning (f=1). Students' expressions relating to these findings in this study are given below:

K11: It was different from all other classes... We tried to understand better.

K12: We understood many things due to activities.

K17: I didn't find this subject very important. I thought that I knew everything about this subject. But I realized that I don't know many things after the lesson.

Students' opinions show that creative drama and other interactive teaching methods are effective in developing students' metacognitive skills.

Students stated that CDEL enriched with creative drama and other interactive methods helped them increase their confidence (f=5) and sense of responsibility (f=3), develop a positive attitude towards the lesson (f=1) and to the environment (f=1), and create awareness towards the events they face (f=1). Students' expressions relating to these findings are given below:

K16: Due to these role-plays, my self-confidence increased. Also, I couldn't present my homework in class before. My legs were shaking during presentation. It doesn't happen anymore.

K15: Group activities showed that we could cooperate. Everyone had a responsibility. We also learned to fulfill our responsibility.

K9: Your attitude towards the lesson was good. I will give an example: I was happy when drama hour came because it helped us relax after an exam. I like this class. I attended it willingly. I have never said that "Hasn't it finished yet?" during this class.

K7: Activities were very creative. It changed our perspective to the environment. We think more positive about the environment compared to before.

It can be determined that the activities and role-plays used in classes enable students to learn by experiencing, express themselves, and thus increase their self-confidence. It is clear that the students, whose confidence levels have increased, are better now at presentations in classes.

The role-play phase of creative drama, sharing tasks, taking and fulfilling responsibilities contributed to students' cognitive development. It can be stated that activities enabled students to develop a positive attitude towards environment, become more sensitive to the environmental issues and create awareness relating to events.

After CDEL activities enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods, some of the students stated that their belief towards learning changed ($f=1$) and their enthusiasm of learning increased ($f=1$). Students' expressions relating to these findings are given below:

K2: I believed we could learn better because most of the activities were physical.

K11: It was different from all other classes, so it was new for us. That's why we wanted to learn. It was fun, not boring. We didn't feel suffocated. We were having good time.

Students' attendance to classes and structuring their role-play process benefiting from their own experiences could increase their belief and enthusiasm towards learning.

It was determined that creative drama and other interactive teaching methods used in CDEL enabled students to share the tasks ($f=2$) and students were pleased with this method of sharing tasks ($f=1$). It was also concluded that group studies increased peer interaction among students ($f=1$). Students' expressions relating to these findings are given below:

K2: There was cooperation because activities were mostly group activities and it was very fun as everyone was pleased.

K15: Group activities showed that we cooperated with each other.

K10: Everyone had a responsibility. We learned to fulfill our responsibilities in this class. That's why activities were very effective for us.

According to students' opinions, doing most of the activities as a group in classes provided solidarity among students and enabled them to learn their responsibilities.

Two students stated their positive and negative opinions about the environment where CDEL was doneconducted. One of them found positive to do the course in a different environment ($f=1$) while the second one thought that the learning environment was not suitable ($f=1$). Students' expressions relating to these findings are given below:

K9: Doing the course in a different environment was interesting for us because we had all of our courses within the class. The class was not spacious and there was no fresh air. Getting on stage was a wonderful feeling for us.

K10: I think it was perfect to perform the drama in gym instead of the class. It was very fun.

K4: It was beautiful. But sometimes it was boring. Because it was cold and we couldn't listen to you. That's why I think it was boring. But other activities were very good.

According to the students, doing the course in a different environment out of the classroom made it interesting for them. However, students evaluated that the learning environment was not warm enough in winter, which was a negative situation in terms of doing activities.

CDEC, whose activities were enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods by the researcher, was applied to the experiment group for 28 weeks. It was determined that the program applied to the experiment group was significantly more effective in increasing students' academic achievements and creating a devotion towards democratic values in students compared to the program applied to the control group. It was concluded that methods and techniques such as mainly creative drama, case study method, speaking ring, six hats thinking technique, brainstorming, developing opinions, station technique, large group discussion and question-answer technique need to be used in future classes of citizenship, democracy and human rights.

Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

In consequence of this research aiming to determine the reasons of students' academic achievements and devotion to democratic values, and underlying reasons of successful students as a conclusion of applying CDEC using creative drama and other interactive teaching methods, and suggest a program for the future education, it was determined that the change observed in students' achievements in experiment groups, in which CDEC enriched with creative drama method was applied, was significantly different from the change observed in control group students' achievements. In other words, students' achievements changed as a result of applied experimental process. It can be stated that this change in students' achievements result from the program enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods.

Considering the research directly or indirectly related to the result in literature, it was seen that CDEC and similar classes had not reached their achievements. For example, CDEC and similar programs were evaluated in research and it was determined that students had not reached their achievements to a large extent (Güven, 2010; İnan, 2005; Toraman, 2012; Uyangör, 2007). The reason of this was determined as that the learning – teaching environment was not arranged for students to be active, only methods such as expression, question – answer and discussion were used (Arıkan, 2002; Başaran, 2007; Candan, 2006; Kıvanç, 2003; Ulubey, Koçer and Toraman, 2013; Uyangör, 2007). For students to reach their achievements for the classes such as human rights, citizenship and democracy education etc., methods to provide students' participation in learning and teaching process should be used. Creative drama and other interactive teaching methods also enable students to be active in learning – teaching process. In limited research in which creative drama was used as a method in human rights education, it is possible to see that the achievements of human rights education were reached. For example, Kaya (2002) used creative drama method while teaching concepts on human rights, and Üstündağ (1997) used this method while teaching the unit of "Our Basic Rights and Duties in Independent Democracy" in the course of Citizenship and Human Rights Education taught to the 8th grade students in secondary school; and it was stated that students reached their target behaviors to a large extent. Similarly, it was determined that students' achievements also increased during the research in which interactive teaching methods were used. For example, as a result of the research, it was found that interactive teaching methods had a positive effect on students' achievements in teaching Badminton (Özcan, 2009), Social Sciences (Aykaç, 2007), Geography (Yücelbilgili, 2010) and geometry in the secondary school's math class (Aksu and Keşan, 2011). In short, both this research and other studies in literature showed that students reached the achievements of the class when creative drama and other interactive teaching methods were used. It was concluded that there was a significant difference for the benefit of experiment group between the pre-test and post-test scores that students in experiment and control 1 group got from Devotion to Democratic Values (DDVS). However, no significant difference was found between students' pre-test and post-test scores of DDVS in control 1 and control 2 groups. This result shows that CDEC enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods is more effective in creating devotion to democratic values than the program developed by MONE (Ministry of National Education).

In other studies in literature, it was determined that Citizenship and Human Rights Education Class Programs developed by MONE for 7th grade students in secondary school had not provided any significant change in students' attitudes (Aras, 2000; Uyangör 2007). However, it was found that there were significant changes in students' attitudes in studies, which used creative drama as a method. For example, Üstündağ's (1997) doctoral dissertation showed that students developed a positive attitude towards the course in Citizenship and Human Rights Education taught by using creative drama method. These findings indicated that there was no significant change in students' attitudes in classes of human rights, democracy and citizenship education. However, significant changes were found in students' devotion to democratic values in classes in which creative drama method was used. It can be stated that students participating the learning – teaching process gained democratic values with games, role-plays and methods which help them be active.

It was concluded that activities enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods enabled students to learn by experiencing and having fun, remember the information they learned for a longer time, find the classes interesting and participate in courses, prepare for real life, build empathy, express themselves, develop their creativity, imagination and thinking skills, make better senses of the subjects, be aware of what they learned, increase their self-confidence, take responsibility within a group and fulfill these responsibilities, develop a positive attitude towards course and environment, be sensitive about environmental issues, create awareness towards events, increase their dedication and motivation towards learning, increase sharing and cooperation during the tasks,, and be pleased with sharing tasks. Furthermore, it was found that having a class in a different environment out of classroom made the class more interesting. These results explain the underlying reasons of success of the program enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods.

As a consequence of this research, it was determined that the program, which was developed by using the methods and techniques such as mainly creative drama, case study method, speaking ring, six thinking hats technique, brainstorming, developing opinions, station technique, large group discussion and question-answer technique, could increase students' achievements about citizenship, democracy and human rights, and develop their attitudes in a positive way. Shortly, this proposed program could be used in future citizenship, democracy and human rights education programs.

Future Education and Citizenship and Democracy Education Programme

Within the scope of this study, it can be said that Citizenship and Democracy Education Programme formed by the researcher can prepare individuals for future in the context of citizenship, democracy, human rights education. With this programme, the importance of students' attendance to all decision making mechanisms involving themselves and the society was emphasized. It was tried to make the students become active citizens by attending decision making mechanisms around them. Students did the activities by experiencing, acting, and they embraced future values such as freedom, justice, respect to human rights, reconciliation, sensibility, tolerance, honesty, respect to differences and life, solidarity, value human life, and avoid violence easier. Besides, students are told to never discriminate regardless of religion, language, gender, and race during the Citizenship and Democracy Education Programme, and a universal human rights culture among them was tried to be established. Thus, the programme contributed to raise individuals who are respectful to human rights, and are suitable for future necessities, and also participative and democrat. It can be said that this contribution was resulted from creative drama and other interactive teaching methods used in the programme. Because during the interviews conducted in the scope of the research, students stated that methods used in the implementation made learning easier, provided learning through experience, caused the lesson to be more fun and interesting, provided attendance to lesson, increased self-confidence, creativity, imagination, belief and interest to learning. Hence it can be said that methods used in the programme have an important place in future education. In also the study of Üstündağ (1998), it was stated that creative drama can be seen as an important choice for raising individuals who have behavior pattern of next century. In other researches in literature, the importance of creative drama for future was emphasized. For example; Güray (2014) indicated in his study that creative drama makes learning easier for English teacher candidates, and teacher candidates can use this method in the future. Özdemir and Çakmak (2008) stated that teacher candidates are eager to learn creative drama methods, they can use it in the future during their career, and emphasized that creative drama should be mandatory in faculty of education programs to prepare future class teachers in their study. In addition to this, it was indicated in some studies that drama can make easier the struggle towards potential problems in future education (Catterall, 2009; Cooper, 2010; Gallaher, 2001). As a result, when application results of Citizenship and Democracy Education Programme prepared within the scope of this study and the studies in literature are evaluated together, it can be said that creative drama and other interactive teaching methods will have an important place in future education system.

In accordance with the results obtained from the study, some suggestions were given. Future citizenship, democracy and human rights education courses can be enriched with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods by the Ministry of National Education. To implement future programs, long term in-service trainings can be provided for teachers. Sample classroom environments, in which practices of future programs are implemented, can be created by a team of experts, and can be videotaped to share on the website of the Ministry of National Education. Experimental implementations can be conducted in different lessons to develop curriculums suitable for future education.

References

- Aksu, H. H., & Keşan, C. (2011). İlköğretimde aktif öğrenme modeli ile geometri öğretiminin başarı ve kalıcılık düzeyine etkisi. *Karadeniz Fen Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1), 94-113.
- Aras, H. (2000). *Vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi dersinde öğrencilere insan hakları ile ilgili tutumların kazandırılması* (Unpublished master's thesis). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Science, Ankara.
- Arıkan, F. (2002). *Vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi dersi eğitim programının öğretmen görüşleri doğrultusunda değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Sakarya University, Institute of Social Science, Sakarya.
- Aydeniz, D. (2010). *İlköğretim 4. 5. sınıf sosyal bilgiler dersinin insan hakları ve demokrasi eğitimindeki işlevselliği* (Unpublished master's thesis). Sakarya University, Institute of Social Science, Sakarya.
- Aykaç, N. (2007). Sosyal bilgiler dersinde aktif öğretim yöntemlerinin kullanılmasının öğrencilerin derse karşı tutumuna, erişim düzeyine ve kalıcılığa etkisi. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 23, 24-37.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.) *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Başaran, T. (2007). *İlköğretim okullarında vatandaşlık insan hakları eğitimi programının uygulanışına ilişkin sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin görüşleri*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Trakya University, Institute of Social Science, Edirne.
- Boyer, E. L., & Mitgang, L. D. (1996). *Building Community: A New Future for Architecture Education and Practice. A Special Report*. California Princeton Fulfillment Services; 1445 Lower Ferry Road, Ewing, NJ 08618.
- Brander P., Gomes R., Keen E., Lemineur M.L., Oliveira B., Ondrackova J., Surian A., & Suslova O. (2008). *Pusulula: Gençlerle insan hakları eğitimi kılavuzu* (B. Yeşiladalı, Trans.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Büyükkaragöz, S. S. (1990). *Demokrasi eğitimi*. Ankara: Türk Demokrasi Vakfı Yayınları.
- Candan, R. (2006). *İlköğretim 2. kademe 7. ve 8. sınıfta okutulan vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi dersinin öğretimi ve öğretiminde karşılaşılan güçlükler (Ardahan Örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Selçuk University, Institute of Social Science, Konya.
- Catterall, J. S. (2009). *Doing well and doing good by doing art: the effects of education in the visual and performing arts on the achievements and values of young adults*. Los Angeles/London: Imagination Group/I-Group Books.
- Çiftçi, A. (2008). *Vatandaşlık bilgisi*. (2nd ed.). Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim ve Yayıncılık.
- Cooper, C. (Eds.) (2010). *Making a world of difference, A DICE resource for practitioners on educational theatre and drama*. Retrieved from <http://www.dramanetwork.eu/file/Education%20Resource%20long.pdf>
- Council of Europe (2010). *Council of Europe charter on education for democratic citizenship directorate of education and languages and human rights education*. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/Source/Charter/Charterpocket_EN.pdf.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano-Clark, V. L. (2014). *Karma yöntem araştırmaları: Tasarımı ve yürütülmesi* (A. Delice, Trans.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.
- Crick, B. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools*. London: QCA.
- Crick, B. (2000) *Essays on citizenship*. London: Continuum.
- Çıplak, A. (2002). *İlköğretim 7 ve 8. sınıf vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi ders programlarının değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher education and the American future. *Journal of teacher education*, 61(1-2), 35-47.
- Davis, I. (1994) The nature of education for citizenship. *Social Science Teacher*, 24(1), 2-4.
- DfEE (Department for Education and Employment). (1999). *The national curriculum for England: Citizenship*. London: Department for Education and Employment and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Retrieved from <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/4407>
- Doğanay, A. (2010). What does democracy mean to 14-year-old Turkish children? A comparison with results of the 1999 IEA Civic Education Study. *Research Papers in Education*, 25(1), 51-71. doi:10.1080/02671520802315060
- Doğanay, A., & Sarı, M. (2004). İlköğretim ikinci kademe öğrencilerine temel demokratik değerlerin kazandırılma düzeyi ve bu değerlerin kazandırılması sürecinde açık ve örtük programın etkilerinin karşılaştırılması, *Eğitim Yönetimi*, 10(39), 356-383.
- Dolanbay, H. (2011). *İlköğretim Sosyal Bilgiler Öğretmenliği Programında öğrenim gören öğretmen adaylarının insan hakları ve demokrasi dersinin işlenişine ilişkin görüşleri* (Unpublished master's thesis). İnönü University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Malatya.
- ERG (Eğitim Reformu Girişimi). (2005). *Yeni öğretim programlarını inceleme ve değerlendirme raporu*. Retrieved from ilkogretimonline.org.tr/vol5say1/yenimufredat_raporu%5B1%5D.pdf
- Ermış, H., & Ermış, N. (2009, 28-30 May). Demokrasi eğitiminde dramanın önemi. Proceeding at the I. Uluslararası Avrupa Birliği, Demokrasi, Vatandaşlık ve Vatandaşlık Eğitimi Sempozyumu, Uşak.
- Farrel, J. P. (1998). Democracy and education: Who gets to speak and who is listened to? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(1), 1-7. doi:10.1111/0362-6784.00072
- Flowers, N. (2000). *The human rights education handbook: Effective practices for learning, action, and change*. Human rights education series, topic book. Minneapolis: Human Rights Resource Center.
- Flowers, N. (2010). *Pusulacak: Çocuklar için insan hakları eğitimi* (M. Çulhaoğlu, Trans.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Gallaher K. (2001). *Drama education in the lives of girls: imagining possibilities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Gözütok, F. D. (2011). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri* (3rd ed.). Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınları.
- Guérin, L., Van der Ploeg, P., & Sins, P. (2013). Citizenship education: the feasibility of a participative approach. *Educational Research*, 55(4), 427-440. doi:10.1080/00131881.2013.844945
- Gutman, A. (1993). Democracy and democratic education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 12(1), 1-9.
- Güdücü, H. S. (2008). *İlköğretim programlarında yer alan vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi dersine ilişkin öğretmen algısına yönelik Manisa örneği* (Unpublished master's thesis). Celal Bayar University, Institute of Social Science, Manisa.
- Gülmez, M. (2001). *İnsan hakları ve demokrasi eğitimi*. Ankara: TODAIE Yayınları.
- Güryay, B. (2014). Creative Drama: A Way to Understand Shakespeare? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 1127-1131.
- Güven, M. (2011). Okulöncesinde demokrasi eğitimi ve çocuk haklarında eğitim ortamları. In H. Deveci (ed.), *Okul öncesinde demokrasi eğitimi ve çocuk hakları* (pp. 93-118). Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları, Eskişehir.
- Güven, S. (2010). *İlköğretim birinci kademedeki vatandaşlık eğitimi üzerine bir durum çalışması* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Hodson, D. (2003). Time for action: Science education for an alternative future. *International Journal of Science Education*, 25(6), 645-670.
- Hébert, Y., & Sears, A. (2001). *Citizenship education*. Canadian education association. Retrieved from <http://www.cea-ace.ca/res.cfm?subsection=rep>

- İnan, K. (2005). *İlköğretim 7. sınıf vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi dersi öğretim programında ifadesini bulan temel hak ve özgürlüklerin kazanılma düzeyi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Karadağ, E., & Çalışkan, N. (2005). Eğitim-öğretim sürecinde drama yönteminin yeri ve önemi. *Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 1(2).
- Karaman-Kepenekçi, Y. (2000). *İnsan hakları eğitimi*. Anı Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Karaman-Kepenekçi, Y. (2003). Demokratik okul. *Eğitim Araştırmaları*, 11, 44-53.
- Karaman-Kepenekçi, Y. (2005). A Study of effectiveness of human rights education in Turkey. *Journal of Peace Education*, 2(1), 53-68. doi:10.1080/1740020042000334091
- Karaman-Kepenekçi, Y. (2008). *Eğitimciler için insan hakları ve vatandaşlık*. Ankara: Ekinoks Yayınları.
- Kaya, M. (2002). *Polisin insan hakları eğitiminde yaratıcı drama yönteminin kullanılması*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Kerr, D. (1999). *Citizenship education: an international comparison* (International Review of Curriculum and Assessment Frameworks Paper 4). London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.
- Kıvanç, Ö. (2003). *İlköğretim insan hakları eğitimi sürecinin Avrupa Konseyi insan hakları eğitimi çerçevesinde öğretmenler tarafından değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Çukurova University, Institute of Social Science, Adana.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd ed.) Edition Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kuzgun, Y. (2000). Eğitimde kendini gerçekleştirme. A. Şimşek (Ed.). In *Sınıfta demokrasi* (pp. 1-26.). Eğitim Sen Yayınları, Ankara.
- Levin, B. (1998). The educational requirement for democracy. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 28(1), 57-79.
- Linkoln, Y. S., & Guba, G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. California: Sage Publication.
- Lister, I. (1982). Issues in teaching and learning about human rights. *General Education*, 36, 8-13.
- Maitles, H., & Gilchrist I. (2006). Never too young to learn democracy!: A case study of a democratic approach to learning in a religious and moral education (RME) secondary class in the west of scotland. *Educational Review*, 58(1), 67-85. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131910500352721#.VEJXofl_uPU
- Martin, J. P. (1996). *Self-help human rights education handbook*. Center for the study of Human Rights: Columbia University.
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (1930). *1926 ilköğretim müfredat programı*. İstanbul Devlet Matbaası.
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (1936). *1936 İlkokul programı*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (1957). *1948 İlkokul programı*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (1968). *1968 İlkokul programı*. İstanbul: Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (1995). *İlköğretim genel müdürlüğü ortaokul programı* (2nd ed.). Ankara.
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (2003). *Türkiye'de ilköğretim (Dünü, bugünü, yarını)*. Milli Eğitim Basımevi, İstanbul.
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (2010) *İlköğretim vatandaşlık ve demokrasi eğitimi dersi (8. sınıf) öğretim programı*. Retrieved from <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program.aspx?tur=ilkogretim&lisetur=&ders=&sira=&sinif=&sayfa=3>
- MEB (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı). (2015). *İlkokul İnsan Hakları, Yurttaşlık ve Demokrasi Dersi Öğretim Programı Kurul Kararı*. Retrieved from <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx/program2.aspx?islem=1&kno=245>.
- Meriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to desing and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Millar, R., & Osborne, J. F. (Eds.) (1998). *Beyond 2000: Science education for the future*. London: King's College London.
- Naval, C., Print, M., & Veldhuis, R. (2002). Education for democratic citizenship in the New Europe: Context and reform. *European Journal of Education*, 37(2), 107-128. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-3435.00097/abstract>
- Oğuzkan, F. (1981). *Eğitim terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Özbek, R. (2004). *Vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi ders amaçlarının gerçekleştirme düzeyi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Atatürk University, Institute of Social Science, Erzurum.
- Özbudun, E. (1989, 30 November- 1 December). Tarihsel gelişim içinde demokrasi ve eğitim. In A. Ferhan O. (Ed). Paper at the *Türk Eğitim Derneği XIII Eğitim Toplantısı* (pp. 3-34), Ankara.
- Özcan, B. (2009). *Aktif öğretim ve klâsik öğretim yöntemlerinin badminton ders konusuna yönelik duyuşsal ve psikomotor erişi düzeylerine etkisi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mersin University, Graduate School of Health Sciences, Mersin.
- Özdemir, S. M., & Çakmak, A. (2008). The effect of drama education on prospective teachers' creativity. *International Journal of Instruction*, 1(1), 13-30.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Nitel araştırma ve değerlendirme yöntemleri* (S. Çelik and F. Ö. Karataş, Trans.). Pegem Akademi, Ankara.
- Peigen, L. (2010). The practical consciousness of the future engineering education. *Research in Higher Education of Engineering*, 6, 002.
- Rasmussen, M. L. (2012). *The human rights education toolbox: A Practitioner's guide to planning and managing human rights education*. Copenhagen: The Danish Institute for Human Rights.
- Rugarcia, A., Felder, R. M., Woods, D. R., & Stice, J. E. (2000). The future of engineering education I. A vision for a new century. *Chemical Engineering Education*, 34(1), 16-25
- Sarı, M. (2007). *Demokratik değerlerin kazanımı sürecinde örtük program: Düşük ve yüksek okul yaşam kalitesine sahip iki ilköğretim okulunda nitel bir çalışma* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Çukurova University Institute of Social Science, Adana.
- Sarı, M., Sarı, S., & Ötünç, M. S. (2008). İlköğretim öğrencilerinin demokratik değerlere bağlılıkları ve çatışma çözümü becerileri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 8(1), 161-192. Retrieved from <http://www.edam.com.tr/kuyeb/pdf/tr/a77f8511cabb5018cd1cba1a45b158231full.pdf>
- Schaefer, E. S. (1991). Goals for parent and future-parent education: Research on parental beliefs and behavior. *The Elementary School Journal*, 91(3), 239-247.
- Schulz, W., Fraillon, J., & Ainley, J. (2011). *ICCS 2009 Technical report*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). Retrieved from http://www.iea.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Electronic_versions/ICCS_2009_Technical_Report.pdf
- Scott, D., & Lowson, H. (2002). *Citizenship education and the curriculum*. London: Ablex Publishing.
- Selvi, K. (2011). Dünyada ve Türkiye'de demokrasi eğitiminin gelişimi. In H. Deveci (Ed.). *Okul öncesinde demokrasi eğitimi ve çocuk hakları* (pp. 47-67). Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları, Eskişehir
- Tibbitts, F. (2008). Human rights education. *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*. Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://www.tc.edu/centers/epe>
- Toper, T. (2007). *İlköğretim ikinci kademedeki demokrasi eğitimi: ikinci kademe öğretmenlerinin demokratik tutum ve davranışları sergileme düzeyleri (Kars ili örneği)* (Unpublished master's thesis). Kafkas University, Institute of Social Science, Kars.
- Toraman, Ç. (2012). *İlköğretim 8. sınıf Vatandaşlık ve Demokrasi Eğitimi Ders Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

- Ulubey, Ö. Koçer, E., & Toraman Ç. (2013, 18-19 October). Problems and solutions on implementation of civilization and democracy education program. Proceeding at the *European Conference on Curriculum Studies-Future Directions: Uncertainty and Possibility*. Minho University, Portekiz.
- UN (United Nations). (1996). *International plan of action for the decade of human rights education*. Geneva-Switzerland: United Nations.
- UNESCO, (2012). *World programme for human rights education*. Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/WPHRE_Phase_2_en.pdf
- Uyangör, N. (2007). *İlköğretim 7. sınıf Vatandaşlık ve İnsan Hakları Eğitimi Programının değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Science, Ankara.
- Üstündağ, T. (1997). *Vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi dersinin öğretiminde yaratıcı dramının erişiyeye ve derse yönelik öğrenci tutumlarına etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Institute of Social Science, Ankara.
- Üstündağ, T. (1998). Yaratıcı drama eğitim programının öğeleri. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 22(107), 28-35.
- Young, M. (2010). The future of education in a knowledge society: The radical case for a subject-based curriculum. *Journal of the Pacific Circle Consortium for Education*, 22(1), 21-32.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (9th ed.). Seçkin Yayıncılık, Ankara.
- Yücelbilgili, Ö. (2010). *Ortaöğretim coğrafya dersinde aktif öğretimin öğrenci başarısına etkisi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Gazi University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Ankara.