Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi

Hacettepe University Journal of Education

e-ISSN: 2536-4758

Evaluation of Human Rights, Civics and Democracy Curriculum through Eisner's Evaluation Framework[*]

Özge KARAKUŞ ÖZDEMİRCİ[**], Afra Nur AKSOY[***], Ahmet OK[****]

Article Information	ABSTRACT
Received: 11.08.2018 *Accepted*: 25.03.2019 *Online First*: 25.04.2019 *Published*: 31.01.2020	Human Rights, Civics and Democracy Curriculum for 4th graders was began to be implemented in 2015-2016 academic year. In this study, we aim to evaluate this curriculum regarding the universality of human rights concept; the appropriateness of the curriculum with its educational goals, content, instructional material and methods in terms of students' cognitive level and finally teacher competencies to teach this course. A qualitative intrinsic case study method was utilized. The data was collected through document analysis; eight-hours of classroom observation, and semi-structured interviews with seven elementary school teachers and six "experts". Eisner's Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model was used as an evaluation framework. Deductive content analysis was used to analyze the data and to illuminate specific details about the case under investigation. Results showed that attainments and content were consistent with the universality of human rights perspective; also, instruction and assessment methods were consistent with the philosophy (constructivism) of the curriculum. However, the course material, as regards to its aims, content and philosophy; and the practices applied inside the classroom were highly inconsistent with the goals of the curriculum. **Keywords:** Human rights and civics education, curriculum evaluation, Eisner's connoisseurship and criticism model

İnsan Hakları, Yurttaşlık ve Demokrasi Dersi Öğretim Programının Eisner'ın Değerlendirme Modeli ile Değerlendirilmesi

Makale Bilgisi	ÖZET
Geliş Tarihi: 11.08.2018 *Kabul Tarihi*: 25.03.2019 *Erken Görünüm Tarihi*: 25.04.2019 *Basım Tarihi*: 31.01.2020	2015-2016 eğitim öğretim yılında 4. sınıf öğrencileri için İnsan Hakları, Yurttaşlık ve Demokrasi dersi öğretim programı uygulamaya konulmuştur. Bu çalışma ile öğretim programını, insan hakları kavramının evrenselliği; programın eğitim hedeflerinin, içeriğinin, öğretim materyalleri ve yöntemlerinin öğrencilerin bilişsel düzeyi açısından uygunluğu ve son olarak öğretmenlerin bu dersi verebilmek için yeterlikleri açısından değerlendirmek amaçlanmıştır. Çalışmada, nitel gerçek durum çalışması yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Veriler doküman analizi, sekiz saatlik ders gözlemi, yedi ilkokul öğretmeni ve altı "uzman" ile yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmeler doğrultusunda toplanmıştır. Eisner'ın Eğitsel Uzmanlık/ Eleştiri Modeli değerlendirme çerçevesi olarak kullanılmıştır. Verileri ve araştırılan durum hakkındaki detayları analiz etmek için tümdengelimsel içerik analizi kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar, kazanımların ve içeriğin insan hakları kavramının evrenselliği ile tutarlı olduğunu göstermiştir; ayrıca, öğretim ve değerlendirme yöntemleri, programın felsefesi (yapılandırmacılık) ile tutarlı bulunmuştur. Ancak ders materyali, amaçları, içeriği ve felsefesi açısından; sınıf içinde uygulanan etkinlikler ise genel olarak, programın hedefleri ile son derece tutarsız bulunmuştur. **Anahtar Sözcükler:** İnsan hakları ve yurttaşlık eğitimi, program değerlendirmesi, Eisner'ın uzmanlık/eleştiri modeli

[*] The earlier version of this paper is presented at the 5th International Conference on Curriculum and Instruction (October, 2017), Muğla, Turkey.

[**] PhD Candidate, Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Ankara-TURKEY. e-mail: ozge.karakus@metu.edu.tr (ORCID: 0000-0003-3957-2711)

[***] English Instructor, PhD, Elmadağ Police Vocational Training Center, Ankara-TURKEY. e-mail: nur2634@gmail.com (ORCID: 0000-0001-9062-3233)

[****] Prof. Dr., Middle East Technical University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Ankara-TURKEY. e-mail: as@metu.edu.tr (ORCID: 0000-0002-5941-4158)

1. INTRODUCTION

Modern citizenship is the concept of the modern positivist world (Sassen, 2002) and modern education has been utilized to educate "modern" responsible citizens who take a role in the present and future of the state (Marshall & Bottomore, 2000). Citizenship education can be defined as educating children from early childhood to become clear-thinking and enlightened citizens who participate in decisions concerning society and who are responsible for the achievement of peaceful, sustainable and inclusive societies (Tibbitts, 2015). Historically, each country has had a concept of "good citizen" regarding its political, cultural, social, or economical context to ensure its existence (Brubaker, 1998) and this concept could change in time regarding the political, social or economic alterations. In this context, education has been used as a state-apparatus[1] and citizenship education either as a separate course or as an inter-disciplinary subject has been considered significant in modern countries, throughout the history.

However, the worldwide political and economic shifts, especially after World War II, have changed the meaning of citizenship. International migration increased diversity; globalization changed the direction of economy which, in the end, affected nation-wide politics and culture. Besides, development of international communities and declarations on human rights also had an influence on the deconstruction of citizenship concept (Balibar, 2016; Marshall & Bottomore, 2000). Those shifts have eventually affected the philosophy and content of citizenship education, it had to be evolved from "mono" to "multicultural" perspective. Recently, it is more than a need; it is a necessity to transform both the notion of citizenship and the content of citizenship education (Çayır, 2016; Noddings, 2013).

The aim or the content of citizenship education has also been changed many times in the historical and political process of Turkish Republic. The modernization of the country and the conceptualization of "modern citizenship" dates back to the Second Constitutional Period during Ottoman Empire; this is when there was a change about the status of people living in the land: from vassal to citizen (Üstel, 2014). However, proclamation of the Republic and especially acceptance of the Law on Unification of Education in 1924 was the starting point of the nation-building process (Keyman, 2012; Üstel, 2014). Since 1923, citizenship education has been a tool of the 'state-centric modernization project' (Çapar, 2006; Ünal, 2004), which aimed to reshape the society through modernism and patriotism and to create an organic Turkish society out of the Ottoman Empire that based on multi-ethnicity (Üstel; 2014). In other words, modernization of the country through a nation-state project was the primary goal; and citizenship education was formed through nation-building idea (Keser, Akar & Yıldırım, 2011). Besides, sacrificing one's self for the country, militarism and patriotism were the most characteristic ideas of citizenship education during the single party period (Altınay & Bora, 2002).

There was a serious change on the concept of citizen and in the content of citizenship education with multi-party period. The citizen, whose life had been limited to the "public sphere", became to be defined through a liberal perspective, which brought up the concept of "private sphere" (Üstel, 2014). After the military coup in 1980, the definition of 'nation' gained a new meaning, with the inclusion of language, religion, and race along with cultural and historical unity. The emphasis on religion was more visible than before; besides, the content of "us" was constricted while the content of "others or enemies" was expanded. After the military coup, the citizens of the Republic had many internal enemies additional to the external ones (Altınay & Bora, 2002; İnce, 2012).

In 1980s, Turkey started to adopt neoliberal policies (Şenses, 2012). This also affected the philosophy of education, as the integration of global economy increased relations with European Union (EU) and this brought along some reforms in education. In 1993, the Copenhagen Criteria, which underlined that each candidate country had to achieve the stability in institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and the respect for protection of minorities, supported a serious revision in citizenship education. And with the declaration of United Nations for 'Decade for Human Rights Education' in 1995, MoNE (Ministry of National Education) changed both the name ("Human Rights and Citizenship Education") and the content of the citizenship education. The existence of 'human rights' and 'democracy' in citizenship education could be regarded as an important development in the history of citizenship education (Çayır & Bağlı, 2011; Çayır & Gürkaynak, 2008; Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2005).

Although there are changes regarding the concepts and content since 1990s; some people claimed that a close analysis of the curricula and textbooks shows some inconsistencies between "claims" and "reality". For instance, according to Çayır and Gürkaynak (2008) universal themes that should be taught through universal values stand side by side with nationalist and authoritarian citizenship understanding. They criticized the textbooks as being militaristic and nationalistic even though some chapters included references about human rights. MoNE abolished "Citizenship and Human Rights Education" course in 2005 and thereafter the content was included as "interdisciplinary" subject. "Citizenship and Democracy Education" course was re-added to general curricula of 8th grade as compulsory subject in 2011-2012 academic year. Çayır's (2011) analysis showed that compared to the previous textbook, the chapters which extoll militarism were removed while human rights content was increased. However, "*the Citizenship and Democracy Education course is still based on Turkishness with a single language and a single culture*". According to him, human rights are represented as abstract without making any connections to the problems of citizenship notion in Turkey.

---

[1] See Althusser (1971) for the meaning of "*state-apparatuses*".

Recently, there has been a new curriculum for 4th grades which is a product of a four-year project (2011-2015) "Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education Project" (DVE/İHE)-. As one of the substantial product of the project, "Human Rights, Civics and Democracy curriculum" was decided to be implemented starting from 2015-2016 academic year by Turkish Education Board, in 2012. The course was prepared as a compulsory course and applied to the general curricula of 4th grades as two course hours a week. Thus, after 20 years, human rights, democracy and civics concepts were re-included as a separate course in general elementary school curricula. However, there was a drawback about the development process of the curriculum. Field testing was not practiced and stakeholder feedbacks were not taken about practicality and appropriateness of the curriculum. Besides, there are some concerns and criticisms about its' philosophy, content, instructional material and methods. According to the report by Human Rights Education Cooperation Network (IHEA, 2015), which is a non-governmental organization studying on human rights education, the "we" concept emphasized many times both in the curriculum and in the course material was quite problematic as regards to the universality of human rights. From past to present, indoctrination of nationalist ideology, assimilationist, state-centered and duty-based understanding of citizenship and human rights curricula and the published textbooks have been voiced many times (Çayır & Bağlı, 2011; Çayır & Gürkaynak, 2008; Tarba-Ceylan & Irzık, 2004) and these are still expressed as issue of concerns for the current curriculum and its course material.

Another concern was about the appropriateness of educational attainments, content, instructional material and methods of the curriculum for students' cognitive level. Some claimed that the curriculum and especially its course material written by Ülger, Dombaycı and Feyzioğlu (2015) were not appropriate regarding students' cognitive level. Thirdly, although there was training for a limited number of teachers inside the project -385 teachers out of 247.000 teachers were trained-, the vast majority of elementary school teachers have not participated any in-service training. Previous studies showed the ineffectiveness of human rights and citizenship education due to teacher incompetency's and used teaching-learning methods (Gözütok & Ulubey, 2015; Güven, 2010; Karaman-Kepenekçi, 2005). Thus, teacher qualifications and competencies are significant and still a matter of concern as many of the classroom teachers have just started to teach human rights, civics and democracy through a separate content. Consequently, it was quite crucial to evaluate this newly developed and newly implemented curriculum.

Within the context of the above background and rationales, the present evaluation study has three purposes to investigate regarding these research questions: (1) How appropriate is the newly introduced curriculum regarding human rights concept as a universal value? (2) How appropriate is the curriculum in terms of the content, instructional materials and methods as regards to students' cognitive level? (3) Do teachers perceive themselves ready to implement this curriculum prepared for elementary schools?

2. METHOD

2.1. Research Design

A qualitative case study was utilized to investigate the concepts included in the Human Rights, Civics and Democracy curriculum through their real-life contexts. According to Yin (2014) a case study design should be carried out to investigate the phenomenon in its real-world context: if the focus is on the reasons; the researcher cannot manipulate the behavior of participants in the study; boundaries are not clear between the phenomenon and context, and the researcher wants to cover contextual conditions. In our study, the Human Rights, Civics and Democracy curriculum was the case; and the main rationale was investigating the concepts included in the curriculum through their real-life contexts as regards to the perspectives of experts. Data sources were diversified to analyze the case from multiple perspectives and comprised of documents -curriculum and its course material-, semi-structured interviews -with teachers and experts-, and classroom observation. After explaining evaluation model, participants, instruments, data collection procedures, data analysis and trustworthiness are articulated in separate parts.

2.2. Evaluation Model: Eisner's Evaluation Framework

This study utilized Eisner's Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model from intuitionist/pluralist perspective (Gredler, 1996) to provide a critical understanding and comprehensive information about the phenomenon studied. This study mainly aimed to evaluate the Human Rights, Civics and Democracy Curriculum regarding its appropriateness from many dimensions and readiness level of teachers. The question of who could judge these points brought us to Eisner's Educational Connoisseurship and Criticism Model which heavily relies on expert judgment.

There are two critical terms in Eisner's model: connoisseurship and criticism. According to him (1991), "*a connoisseur is someone who has worked at the business of learning how to see, to hear, to read the image or text and who, as a result, can experience more of the work's qualities than most of us*" (pp. 174). To be a connoisseur requires having knowledge to see, having ability to differentiate subtleties and to be aware of and understand the experience. On the other hand, criticism is about making the experience public through some form of representation. Hence, the duty of expert is about the awareness related to a program, project, or effect of teaching while critic is to announce this awareness to public (Eisner, 2003).

As the main aim of the study was mostly about analyzing the underlying philosophy of the current curriculum; more comprehensive and in-depth data was needed through a qualitative understanding. Eisner had negative views on traditional approaches that focus on educational outcomes only. He (1991) claimed that "*Evaluation requires a sophisticated, interpretive map not only to separate what is trivial from what is significant, but also to understand the meaning of what is known* (pp.193)". He has concerns about the incomplete pictures of schooling yielded by traditional quantitative evaluation (Gray, 1981) and he noted that "*things that matter cannot be measured quantitatively*" (as cited in Alkin & Christie, 2013; pp. 34).

In the present study, evaluators were critics during the whole evaluation process. According to Eisner (1976; 1991) the evaluator should be both insider and outsider to draw a holistic picture. The four stages in his model -*descriptive, interpretive, and evaluative and theming*- shows the tasks of evaluator (Alkin & Christie, 2013; Sıcak & Arsal, 2013). This evaluation model supported the evaluators by enabling them to perform as insiders and critics during the whole evaluation process.

2.3. Participants

Human Rights, Civics and Democracy curriculum is a national curriculum which applied to general curricula of elementary schools. There are 27.544 elementary schools in Turkey (MoNE, 2015), and there was a need to specify the context to evaluate the curriculum. The main part of the study which includes teacher interviews and in-class observations was conducted in Sinop. Sinop is one of the less-populated cities in Turkey. There are only 28 elementary schools (*n=28*) and 492 elementary school teachers (*n=492*) in the central district (MoNE, 2015). 25 teachers (6.5%) out of 385 teachers attended the in-service training from Sinop; when the population of elementary school teachers was considered, it was easier to reach the trained teachers. Besides, one of the authors was living and working in that city.

For in-class observations, a 4th grade class located in the central district was chosen based on voluntariness of the teacher and observed during Human Rights, Civics and Democracy course for eight hours with class size of 22.

Part of the data was collected from elementary school teachers, and experts- subject specialists, an academician from elementary education department, and project coordinators- through semi-structured interviews. Purposive sampling was used to find information-rich cases to study in depth (Patton, 1990). Diverse strategies and different criteria were determined for each group of participants as they had different characteristics and different roles inside the research process.

Maximum variation sampling strategy was used while selecting teachers. The teachers (*n*=7) were selected regarding their opinions -whether they criticize the curriculum or not- to get both perspectives. By considering the effect of the in-service training on teachers' opinions and skills, teachers' attendance to the training for this curriculum was also considered.

For subject specialist, criterion sampling method was used. Eight subject specialists from non-governmental organizations and universities were e-mailed; only five of them responded. Three subject specialists were interviewed as they sustained the specified conditions -working and studying on human rights and democracy education actively and examining the curriculum and the course material beforehand-.

For academicians from elementary education departments, only one academician was reached who was also the writer of the course material of the evaluated curriculum. Lastly, two Project coordinators (Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Project) were interviewed, one of them was project officer and the other one was project assistant; they had both involved in the project process from the very beginning.

2.4. Instruments

The main data collection instruments were semi-structured interview forms and classroom observation forms. Semi-structured interview forms for teachers and experts consisted of demographics and main part. All interview forms were parallel in nature, but some items were included or excluded based on the position and expertise of each cohort. Demographic questions were mainly about previous experiences and current positions of participants in terms of the evaluated curriculum. Main part of the interview forms included questions about the curriculum. For instance, teachers were inquired about their experiences inside the classroom during implementation of the curriculum: such as how appropriate they find the curriculum for children's cognitive level and their developmental and social needs regarding its' philosophy, objectives, content and instructional methods; or the difficulties they encountered. Human rights education experts were consulted about both the evaluated curriculum and their general views on human rights, civics and democracy education (how should be the content, which instruction methods should be preferred, how concepts should be taught for this age group, etc.). The expert from elementary teacher education department were interviewed about readiness and competence of teachers about teaching human rights, civics and democracy; while project coordinators were inquired about the project (aims, experts included, etc.), the curriculum (development and implementation process), the textbook (its' preparation process), the in-service training for teachers and the criticisms made for the curriculum and the textbook.

The other instrument that was utilized for data collection was classroom observation form. It was consisted of three parts: (1) student reactions and questions; (2) teacher's perspective regarding the objectives and the content and her/his preferences in

terms of instruction methods; (3) the problems occurred during class regarding curriculum objectives, content or instructional methods.

2.5. Data Collection Procedures

All the various data procedures were completed in the second term of the academic year 2015-2016 and it was started with document analysis as the criticisms related to curriculum itself and the textbook were the driving forces to start this evaluation study. Document analysis continued throughout preparation of other data collection instruments. After preparing drafts of data collection instruments, expert opinions were taken and forms were revised accordingly. Required permissions were taken from the Ethic Committee of Sinop University and Provincial Directorate of National Education of Sinop.

Pilot interviews were conducted to check accuracy of questions and the tools were finalized in April, 2019. Interviews were conducted with seven 4th grade classroom teachers in their work places (schools) during their free time. The interviews lasted between 15-30 minutes. Two of the classroom teachers preferred to give their opinions in a written form as they had some hesitations related to their voices to be recorded, the rest were recorded and transcribed.

Expert interviews (project coordinators, human rights education experts and academician from elementary education department), were conducted in their work places in Ankara and Kırıkkale by arranging the meetings beforehand and the interviews lasted between 35-45 minutes; one of them was living in Istanbul, thus we conducted a written interview.

2.6. Data Analysis

Deductive content analysis was used to analyze the data and to illuminate specific details about the case under investigation regarding the research questions. For the document analysis, the content of the curriculum and the course material were analyzed. In the first phase, the curriculum was examined and described regarding its aims and objectives, content, teaching-learning process and assessment. In the second phase, the curriculum and its textbook were compared and the content of the textbook was examined through the philosophy and understanding of the curriculum.

For interviews, the transcripts were coded by two researchers separately regarding the research questions and the predetermined themes based on these questions. These eight separate themes for three research questions were: (1) the philosophy of the curriculum; (2) the universality of human rights concept; (3) the citizenship concept; (4) appropriateness of educational attainments; (5) appropriateness of the content; (6) appropriateness of instructional methods; (7) teacher training need; and (8) teacher difficulties. Later, specified codes from two coding processes were determined and crosschecked; the majority of the codes were consistent. The inter-coder reliability, which was calculated by using MAXQDA 18.0.8, was reached with 88.89% agreement on all of the eight codes and according to Neuendorf (2002) .80 or greater would be acceptable in most situations.

For the classroom observation firstly the observer filled out the observation form and based on the data obtained, deductive content analysis procedures were utilized as well; four observation forms were analyzed by two researchers separately based on four separate themes: (1) students' reactions; (2) students' difficulties; (3) instruction method; and (4) teacher difficulties. Codes from two coding processes were determined and crosschecked and the majority of the codes were consistent. The inter-coder reliability, which was calculated by using MAXQDA 18.0.8, was reached with 84.62% agreement on all of the four codes. The observation results were utilized for the research question two and three in which the appropriateness of the curriculum and readiness of the teachers to implement the curriculum were problematized.

2.7. Trustworthiness

Providing credibility, transferability and dependability are significant issues that should be considered in a research study. In the present study, triangulation of data sources, data types and investigators were ensured for credibility by viewing and exploring the case from multiple perspectives (Baxter & Jack, 2008). There were also participant checks to provide credibility; each participant was asked to read the interview document after transcription (Shenton, 2004). Moreover, credibility was enhanced through thick description of context and participants' experiences. The narratives were accompanied the codes to provide a clear picture of the thick data. Purposive sampling was used to increase transferability (Bitsch, 2005). For dependability, the research was systematically structured, and decisions made were systematically implemented during the whole research process while clear description of research process, methodology and participants were ensured for transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1986).

3. FINDINGS

Findings reached from document analysis, interviews and classroom observations were organized and presented regarding research questions.

3.1. Universality of Human Rights Concept in the Curriculum

Textbook analysis demonstrated that the universality of human rights was not considered; there was a "we" emphasis throughout the textbook. There were 30 fairy tales and all of them represented East Asia Turkish culture. Although 18 different cultures were mentioned -such as Terekemes, Azerbaijanis, Kyrgyz, Kurds, Tatars, Armenians, Uyghur Turks, Gagauz, Uzbeks, and Cuvashia societies-, 15 of them represented culture of Turks and Turkic Republics, while only three of them - Kurds, Armenians, and Syriac Christians - represented diverse cultures living in Turkey. On the other hand, for instance Armenians were considered as a community who contribute to "our" culture in some sense (Ülger, Dombaycı & Feyzioğlu, 2015, pp. 87). Thus, it can be claimed through this example, there was a segregation between the concept of "we" (as the 'owners'/ 'hosts') and Armenians as 'guests' of the country.

According to three human rights education experts, both the curriculum and its material were not appropriate regarding the universality of human rights concept. They mainly highlighted that extolling nationalist values and explaining humanitarian values and rights from a nationalist perspective could narrow down the perspective of children. One of the experts (Expt1) emphasized that:

> "Almost all fairy tales are based on the culture of Turks and Turkic Republics. This could shift the focus from universality to nationality. There is a "we" emphasis over the citizenship issue; this could damage the universality of human rights concept as all humans are valuable not only the ones included inside the "us"."

They all thought that the perspective of the curriculum shifted from human rights-based civics understanding to a nationalistic and responsibility-based civics understanding and one of them (Expt3) defined this curriculum as "*more rigid*" than previous ones regarding pluralism issue. Same issue was raised by the insiders of the project and they agreed that most fairy tales represented East Asia culture; whereas this curriculum course material should have represented diversity. One of them (Expt5) emphasized the incoherence about democracy and human rights related concepts; they were found to be problematic in the curriculum. The commonality issue was significant and also voiced by one teacher (T1):

> "It feels like both the curriculum and the course material were developed through the human rights or democracy understanding of the developers. There is no information about the principles or basic tenets of the universal human rights."

The other significant issue about universality of human rights was 'gender equality' and highlighted by four experts. They mainly emphasized that even the language of the textbook was gendered; it has a masculine manner both regarding the characters and the content of the fairy tales, and the understanding about the citizenship concept. There were thirty fairy tales and in only six of them the main characters were women (Ülger, Dombaycı & Feyzioğlu, 2015). Besides, some discriminative gender words were used while defining women such as 'chose' (p. 112) or 'widow' (p. 176).

Experts of human rights education emphasized another significant point about human rights understanding of the curriculum. They thought that the concept of human rights was presented as abstract rather than concrete. One of them (Expt1) claimed that:

> "We believe that, the reality of human rights was manipulated in this curriculum. Building the whole content on fairy tales which have surrealistic elements could hinder and damage the reality of human rights. It feels like human rights are introduced as something unreal. Human rights are presented as something outside the country and time; which also could passivize students."

Two of the human rights education experts highlighted a more rooted issue. They claimed that we still have problems about internalizing concepts or understanding philosophy related human rights which cause superficial understanding about the concepts of democracy and human rights inside the curriculum. For example, one of them (Expt1) highlighted the misuse of some concepts which could cause misconceptions. S/he mainly stated that the human rights concept should be taught independently from "love or tolerance". Every human being has to value all humans' rights regardless their mutual connection. S/he also emphasized the problematic nature of "tolerance" concept; tolerance should not be used while talking about human rights, as it includes a hierarchy inside.

Opinions of elementary school teachers were also quite comprehensive and diverse regarding philosophy and universality of human rights and citizenship concepts of the curriculum. The answers and opinions of teachers are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1.
Teacher opinions on universality of human rights concept in the curriculum

Themes	Consistent with Universality of Human Rights	Not Consisted with Universality of Human Rights
The philosophy of the curriculum	-Example based teaching internalized -Based on and represents the Turks and Turkish culture -I like the philosophy -To raise good citizens -To teach responsibility, respect, love, tolerance, human rights, humanity, justice, equality	-Not realistic -Non-objective -Based on official ideology -It is not based on any philosophy
The universality of human rights concept	-Book includes good examples on human rights -The aim is to teach human rights	-Narrow focus on human rights concept -Not based on universal values -Nothing included about children rights -Only the perspective of authors considered -Included for show off regarding EU -Based on traditional values too much
The citizenship concept	-Good citizen aimed who stick to the rules and laws, loyal to the country and nation, not harm and who is helpful	-Conservative, based on obedience -Aims to create one-type individuals -Not critical and do not have an active citizenship understanding -Too much focus on Turks and Turkish culture -There is a "we" emphasis

As it can be seen from the Table 1, teachers who criticized the curriculum regarding universality concept shared similar ideas with experts. For example, the first teacher (T1) even did not use the course material:

> *"Although the issue of human rights is a universal concept, this curriculum neglects this idea and makes its own definition for human rights and a deal with it in a narrow perspective…the content was used over official ideology which neglects the "truths" or the "reality", has a unilateral perspective…"*

On the other hand, there were some teachers who liked philosophy of the curriculum and claimed that the curriculum aims to teach respect, tolerance, love, equality, justice or responsibility. "Good citizen" concept which was defined through some values such as being loyal to the country, helpful, stick the rules and laws was voiced many times by those teachers.

3.2. Appropriateness of Human Right, Civics and Democracy Curriculum Regarding Cognitive Development Level of Students

The second research question was about the appropriateness of the curriculum and its attainments, content and the instructional methods in terms of students' cognitive development. Teachers' opinions, thoughts and experiences were quite valuable, as they are the ones who implement the curriculum. Their opinions collected through interviews are presented in Table 2.

Table 2.
Teacher opinions on appropriateness of the curriculum to students' cognitive development

Themes	Appropriate	Not Appropriate
Appropriateness of educational goals and objectives	-The chosen concepts are proper and good -Appropriate for students' cognitive development -Students started to treat well to each other -Attainments are well prepared -They could open up students' horizon	-Not proper for students' age level -Far from today and today's needs -Not based on the needs of Turkey and Turkish society -Hard to achieve, students ask a lot of questions -As village school students, my students' readiness is not enough
Appropriateness of the content	-Based on daily examples; and examples are good -Justice, equality, consensus and tolerance emphasized -Students wonder about East Asia culture -Fairy tales catch students' attention to some extent -I like the fairy-tales, consistent with the concepts aimed	-No information on children rights -Nothing given related to today's human rights problems; Does not reflect the truth -Children could not develop empathy over the fairy-tales used -The used language in the book is difficult for age level, there are many ancient Turkish words -Drawings and the content of fairy tales do not reflect today (ancient) -Fairy tales are quite long, students get bored
Appropriateness of the instructional methods	-Students could be active	-Only question-answer method is not useful -Teacher has to make an effort to teach some abstract concepts (especially for early age group) -We need additional materials such as cartoons, visual instruments -There are too many questions after each fairy tale -Questions are not critical

As it can be seen on Table 2, although some of the teachers found the curriculum appropriate regarding students' cognitive level, almost all of them indicated that there were many disused Turkish words that made fairy tales difficult to grasp for students. The document analysis also demonstrated the prevalence of the used ancient words, *bende (slave), perçek (tuber), sedir (sofa), tellal (town crier), oba (nomand tent),*; ancient characters, *vezir (vizier), padişah (sultan), şah (shah), hazret (excellency);* and ancient names, *Hazer, Er Tapıldı, Kardıgaç, Dağoğlu, Avetik, Çilbik, Sancar, İsmail Ebuliz-Cezeri, Ayzere, GökKağan, Asamat, Kudaynazar, Ermankan, Nüşabe,.* The problem is, these words are not modern and children mostly do not hear or use these words, characters or names in their daily lives. Using ancient fairy tales could cause confusion for children, and this was also raised by one of the teachers (T3);

> *"Students always ask the meaning of some words, some names, or some places. Some contemporary and daily words could be used. Especially there are early age group students in my class, and they have more difficulties to understand…"*

Human rights education experts put a significant emphasis on the appropriateness of fairy tales for the age group and shared similar ideas with teachers who found fairy tales inappropriate for this age level of students. One of the experts underlined that (Expt1);

> *"There are ancient words, ancient examples, ancient drawings, characters; character names on the one hand, which could be difficult to understand, and which could cause a chaotic process during the lessons. On the other hand, there are some drawings used to make some words concrete. Such as drawing a question mark to explain the question or drawing soup bowl to explain soup. These are unnecessary, as they probably know these words regarding their age."*

Almost all teachers thought that the instructional method was inappropriate for the age group as there were too many questions to answer. Also, using just question-answer method for this age level of students was not found to be adequate because this age group is at concrete operational stage according to Piagetian cognitive development stages (Piaget, 1954) and although they can solve problems in a logical fashion, they are typically not able to think abstractly. Therefore, additional methods or techniques that will make the concepts more concrete for the children -*such as drama, role playing, using*

visuals/videos, showing cartoon movies, or playing games etc.- were suggested by the teachers. Moreover, observation results showed the problems explicitly. Although the observed teacher thought that the method was appropriate, there were some problems such as students' getting bored because of the number of questions or students' losing their attention because of the repetitiveness of the questions. A student at this age can easily focus on a teacher's question, think about the various possible answers, offer a response, listen to other kids as they offer their responses, and participate in a class discussion (Piaget, 1954). However, the questions were mostly close-ended; there was not any chance for discussing or brain storming to enhance students' critical thinking. Thus, students mainly lost their attention.

To conclude, although some of the teachers liked the content without showing reason, the human rights education experts and some of the teachers agreed on inappropriateness of the content for the age regarding the words/characters inside the fairy tales. Almost all participants reached an agreement in terms of inappropriateness of the method for the cognitive level of children at that age. They mainly claimed that too many close-ended questions could bore children. So, they all agreed the necessity of adding different instructional techniques to link the concepts to daily life both for critical thinking skills and practice.

3.3. Teacher Competencies

The third research question was about teacher competencies needed for implementing Human Rights, Civics and Democracy curriculum. In order to have the elementary school teachers' opinions regarding this readiness issue they were asked whether they need training and why. The teachers who attended in-service training of this course agreed that it was useful to discuss human rights, democracy and citizenship concepts to have a shared understanding and not attended teachers emphasized the necessity of training and they indicated that teaching human rights, democracy, or citizenship concepts as a separate course requires an expertise on the taught concepts and the way of teaching. According to experts, being human rights educator requires competency in these critical concepts. This course is also about internalizing the values by experiencing, how a child understands those values if s/he could not experience during the class. One of the experts (Expt2) raised the issue through a question;

> *"Teachers do not have enough experience related to human rights and democracy teaching; therefore, they will simply stick to the book and just do the activities. Then how students could internalize and how teachers monitor whether their students internalize these concepts or not?"*

The opinions of project coordinators were invaluable in this context because they were the ones who designed the training for elementary school teachers before the implementation of this curriculum but as highlighted before only 385 teachers received the training out of 247.000 teachers in 2015. Similar to the human rights education experts' opinions they also highlighted the importance of teachers' internalizing the human rights and democracy concepts and one of them (Expt5) stated that;

> *"We mainly focused on the techniques for this course; let's say there occurs a hot debate among students about an issue related to democracy how will teacher guide this discussion? S/he should also internalize these concepts and demonstrate them with practice. If s/he is not democratic in her/his behaviors, how could s/he teach democracy?"*

The expert from the project clearly stated a teacher who does not have any training related to this course cannot offer it properly. This course requires special competencies which are not given them in their initial teacher education programs. There is only one elective course related to democracy and human rights in elementary teacher education program and most of teacher candidates do not get this course as it is elective. At this point the expert from elementary teacher education program emphasized same opinions with the experts from the project. S/he was also one of the writers of the course material and s/he thinks that elementary school teachers should get training for this course or elementary teacher education programs should make some amendments in accordance with this newly implemented curriculum for 4th graders. In brief, all participants agreed about in-service training need of teachers for this course because it requires certain competencies and it has different style compared to previous ones. Moreover, considering the main teaching method of the curriculum, teachers should be competent enough to moderate the question-answer process to make it more meaningful and informative for students. Findings from the observations supported the interview findings. Some inconsistent teacher behaviors regarding democracy and human rights were realized during observations, such as asking questions to students in an order, asking questions only to get intended answers, not providing a room to discuss or critical thinking. Teacher had difficulties to conclude the topic and in controlling the process. S/he frequently digressed from the subject, could not start a discussion, and could not connect the subject to the daily lives of students critically. S/he could not be flexible and stuck to the questions and examples from the course material. Therefore, it would not be wrong to conclude regarding the research findings that elementary school teachers who are currently working are in need of receiving further in-service training about the course and possible strategies to teach that age group of children.

4. DISCUSSION and CONSLUSION

The current evaluation study was aimed to evaluate the Human Rights, Civics and Democracy curriculum which has been developed in 2015 and implemented starting from the beginning of 2015-2016 academic year. When the curriculum was

reviewed, it was seen that it has a constructivist perspective and it seemed that the content was also proper and consistent with the universality of human rights perspective. However, findings showed that the course material, as regards to its aims, content and philosophy; and the practices applied inside the classroom were highly inconsistent with the goals of the curriculum.

The name of the course promises civics, human rights and democracy content. However, there is "inescapable" tension between particularity of citizenship concept and universality of human rights (Çayır, 2011). If citizenship is still constructed through duty-based and nationalistic understanding, human rights can only be learned as abstract articles. As many of the participants claimed, including only the culture of Turks and Turkic Republics causes a kind of cultural dominance; Turkey is a multi-cultural country and all cultures' acceptance and visibility is significant. "We" emphasis, that includes only Turks, causes marginalization of minorities and damages the universality of human rights concept. In that point, it is important to highlight that the systematic elimination of curricular topics or not including some information in the curricula could be a kind of representation of the main understanding; as what is excluded from the curriculum is just as important as what is included in order to understand the underlying philosophy (Liston, 1984).

Kymlicka (1995) more than 20 years-ago indicated that "*the world's 184 independent states contain over 600 living language groups and 5000 ethnic groups*". The vast majority of the countries consist of more than one ethnicity, one culture, and one language inside. The meaning of citizenship has been discussed, reconstructed and deconstructed in many nation states through the influences of international migration, globalization and the improvements in human rights (Marshall& Bottomore, 2000; Balibar, 2016). However, this is still a rooted problem in Turkey; citizenship is constructed over one ethnicity, one culture, one religion and one language. Comprehensive analysis over the Project of Promoting Human Rights in Primary and Secondary School Textbooks (Çotuksöken, Erzan & Silier, 2004; Tüzün, 2009; Çayır, 2014) demonstrated that "we" emphasis remain similar during 2000s. Inside the textbooks, Turkish culture and national identity are represented as eternal and constant which cannot change or be changed and which should be protected all time (Çayır, 2016). However, the identity is "*multiple, changing, overlapping and contextual rather than fixed and static*" says Ladson-Billings (2004), and adds "*…People move back and forth across many identities, and the way society responds to these identities either binds people to or alienates them from the civic culture.*". Kuçuradi (2011) suggests a way to overcome the tension between human rights and citizenship strengthening "*active and rights-based citizenship*" understanding rather than "*duty-based and mono-cultural citizenship*" understanding. Besides, inclusion of all ethnicities, cultures is also a must to provide pluralistic and human rights based citizenship education, otherwise "*how can we teach students to respect the rights of others when those others do not exist in textbooks? (Çayır, 2011)."

Regarding the content of the course material, there was a huge inconsistency between the goals of the curriculum and the prepared textbook from many aspects and these problems also voiced by the interviewees. The fairy tales inside the course material present an ancient world and are not about today's needs or do not let future projections. The questions -instruction method is based on these questions- are close ended and do not provide critical thinking. The language of the textbook is quite improper regarding cognitive level and daily needs of students, so many ancient words were used. Izgar (2017) analyzed the textbook regarding constructivism and found similar results. He also highlighted the number of ancient words used, structure of questions asked and the inadequacy of question-answer method to provide daily life connections regarding essentials of constructivism. Studies that analyzed the curriculum and the course-material regarding teachers' views reached similar findings: teachers complained about the content of the course-material and instruction method; they emphasized inappropriateness of fairy tales regarding daily-life connection, the used vocabulary inside and their weak connection to human rights, democracy or civics concepts (Kaçar & Kaçar, 2016; Toprak & Demir, 2017; Kaymakçı & Akdeniz, 2018; Şahan & Tural, 2018). Ulubey and Gözütok (2015) emphasized importance of diversifying instruction methods -such as using creative drama- and proper arrangement of teaching-learning environments to teach human rights, democracy and citizenship. In other words, "horizontal" rather than "hierarchical" teaching-learning process should be ensured and "respect" should be the key component inside the classroom (Flowers, 2010); and interactive learning methods with focus on dialogue and hands-on experiences should be provided for an effective learning process (Rasmussen, 2012). This could be possible through well-developed curriculum, well-prepared course-materials and competent teachers.

However, teacher competencies seem another significant issue, as they mainly felt unprepared, even the experienced ones. Moreover, experts emphasized the need of in-service training for the related concepts and the required competences to teach. Observation results supported the opinions of experts as moderating the discussion or providing a democratic environment requires a thorough understanding regarding both human rights and democracy. Studies emphasize similar findings; teachers do not feel themselves adequate and competent to teach the concepts about human rights civics or democracy as a separate subject. Besides they believe that they were not informed well and were not guided as it should be, prior to implementation (Kaçar & Kaçar, 2016; Toprak & Demir, 2017; Şahan & Tural, 2018). Even some schools could not get the course material prior to beginning of the academic year.

To conclude, there are significant problems about the course-material and teachers do not feel themselves competent to achieve educational attainments of the curriculum. However, the most dramatic findings of this study were derived from observations. During in-class observations the teacher behaved like an authority rather than a moderator, and s/he did not provide a room to discuss. There is no training which ensures the internalization of democracy or human rights without

experiencing. Thus, regardless of curriculum or content of course-material, students first need to experience democracy and human rights as active citizens inside schools and classrooms. In this regard, it can be claimed that one of the reasons of the inconsistency between the goals of the curriculum and its' practices applied inside the classroom could be because of the barriers on democracy and human rights. Moreover, teachers' hesitations about expressing their opinions during interviews could be also one of the dramatic outcomes. That means one of the first requisite of human rights and democracy, "freedom of expression" was broken at teachers' level; how a teacher who does not feel free can teach human rights?

4.1. Implications

This study was mainly conducted through interviews with teachers and experts and they stated their opinions regarding the evaluated curriculum in the areas specified in the research study. Based on their ideas several suggestions were drawn and they are as follows;

1. The course materials of Human Rights, Civics and Democracy course should be prepared regarding human rights philosophy.
2. Teaching methods should be diversified through the curriculum such as games, drama or role-plays should be included in order to make the concepts and values more concrete.
3. This course should provide a room for students to criticize which could not be achieved through ancient fairy tales and close ended questions.
4. Students (in that age group) can read and discuss simplified version of declarations on human and children rights. Reading them and discussing on them can make the concepts and values more concrete for the students.
5. There should be some activities in which students can relate the human rights and democracy concepts to their daily lives and start to use them.
6. Students should experience democracy and human rights inside schools and classrooms as a significant prerequisite of this course.
7. Being human rights educator requires competency on human rights. Therefore, there should be in-service training for teachers and compatible courses should be added to curriculum of elementary education departments for teacher candidates.
8. Human rights education should be an interactive process and provide critical perspectives to students through discussions.

4.2. Limitations

First of all, because of the time restrictions only eight hours of classroom observation was made. However, as the practice and implementation part provide more in depth understanding for both the curriculum and the textbook; more hours of classroom observation would have been beneficial especially for discussing the research findings and providing further practice-based evidence. The other limitation may result from the context of the study. Although this curriculum is a compulsory course and applied countrywide with 4th grades, we conducted our observations and interviews with teachers in Sinop context, thus the result from observations and teacher interviews were specific to that context.

5. REFERENCES

Alkin, M. & Christie, C. (2013). An evaluation theory tree. In M. Alkin (Eds.), *Evaluation Roots* (pp. 12-65)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Altınay, A. G., & Tanıl, B. (2002). Ordu, militarizm ve milliyetçilik. In T. Bora & M. Gültekingil (Eds.), *Modern Türkiye'de siyasi düşünce: Milliyetçilik* (pp. 140-154). İstanbul İletişim.

Balibar, E. (2016). *Yurttaşlık* (M., Erşen, Trans.). İstanbul: Monokl Yayınları.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544-559.

Bitsch, V. (2005). Qualitative research: A grounded theory example and evaluation criteria. *Journal of Agribusiness*, 23(1), 75-91.

Brubaker, R. (1998). Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Çapar, M. (2006). *Türkiye'de eğitim ve "Öteki Türkler".* Ankara: Özgür Üniversite.

Çayır, K. & Gürkaynak, I. (2008) The state of citizenship education in Turkey: Past and present. *Journal of Social Science Education, 6*(2), 50–58.

Çayır, K. & Bağlı, M. T. (2011). 'No-one respects them anyway': secondary school students' perceptions of human rights education in Turkey. *Intercultural Education*, *22*(1), 1-14.

Çayır, K. (2011). Turkey's new citizenship and democracy education course: Search for democratic citizenship in a difference-blind polity? *Journal of Social Science Education*, *10*(4), 22-30.

Çayır, K. (2014). "Biz" kimiz? Ders kitaplarında kimlik, yurttaşlık, haklar. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Çayır, K. (2016). Essentialism, multiculturalism and intercultural education in Turkey's search for the redefinition of national identity. *Eğitim, Bilim, Toplum, 14*(55), 77-101.

Çotuksöken, B., Erzan, A. & Silier, O. (2003). *Ders kitaplarında insan hakları: Tarama sonuçları*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Eisner, E. W. (1976). Educational connoisseurship and criticism: their form and functions in educational evaluation. *Journal of Aesthetic Education, 10*(3/4), 135-150

Eisner, E. (1991). Taking a second look: Educational connoisseurship revisited. In M. W. McLaughlin & D. C. Phillips (Eds.), *Evaluation and education: At Quarter Century (90th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II,* (pp. 169-187). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eisner, E. (2003). Educational connoisseurship and educational criticism: an art-based approach to educational evaluation. In T. Kellaghan & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), *International handbook of Educational Evaluation,* (pp. 153-166). Dordrecht:Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Flowers, N. (2010). Pusulacık: Çocuklar için insan hakları eğitimi (M. Çulhaoğlu, Trans.). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Gray, J. U. (1981). Vintage Connoisseurship: A Practitioner's View of Educational Criticism. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *11*(4), 343-358.

Gredler, M. E. (1996). *Program Evaluation.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

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). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Human Rights Education Cooperation Network, İHEA (2015). Our Thoughts about the Human Rights, Civics and Democracy Curriculum for 4th Graders. Retrieved from http://ihea.net.tr/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=63:ilkokul-4-sinif-insan-haklari-yurttaslik-ve-demokrasi-dersi-taslak-ogretim-programi-na-iliskin-gorusler&catid=42&Itemid=145
Izgar, G. (2017). İnsan hakları, yurttaşlık ve demokrasi ders kitabının yapılandırmacı yaklaşım açısından analizi. *Elementary Education Online, 16*(2), 584-600.

İnce, B. (2012). Citizenship Education in Turkey: Inclusive or Exclusive. *Oxford Review of Education*, *38*(2), 1-17.

Kaçar, H. & Kaçar, M. (2016). İlkokul dördüncü sınıf öğretmenlerinin dördüncü sınıf insan hakları, yurttaşlık ve demokrasi dersine ilişkin görüşleri. *The Journal of International Education Science, 3*(8), 182-196.

Karaman Kepenekçi, Y. (2005). A study of effectiveness of human rights education in Turkey. *Journal of Peace Education*, *2*(1), 53-68.

Kaymakçı, S. & Akdeniz, B. (2018). Evaluation of elementary school 4th grade human rights, citizenship and democracy course's curriculum according to teachers' perspectives: A qualitative research. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 10*(5), 77-93.

Keser, F., Akar, H., & Yıldırım, A. (2011). Role of extracurricular activities in active citizenship education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *43*(6), 809-837.

Keyman, E.F. (2012). Türkiye'de çokkültürlü anayasal vatandaşlık. In A. Kadıoğlu (Eds.), *Vatandaşlığın dönüşümü: Üyelikten haklara*, (pp. 218-244). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Kuçuradi, İ. (2011). *İnsan Hakları: kavramları ve sorunları.* Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu: Türk Felsefesi ya da Simurg Dizisi: Ankara.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2004). Culture versus citizenship: The challenge of racialized citizenship in the United States. In J. A. Banks (Ed.) *Diversity and citizenship education: Global Perspectives* (pp. 99-126). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1986). But is it rigorous? Trustworthiness and authenticity in naturalistic evaluation. In D. D. Williams (Ed.), *Naturalistic evaluation* (pp. 73–84). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Liston, D.P. (1984). Have we explained the relationship between curriculum and capitalism? An analysis of the selective tradition. *Educational Theory, 34*(3), 241-253.

Marshall, T.H. & Bottomore, T. (2000). *Yurttaşlık ve toplumsal sınıflar*. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayıncılık.

Ministry of National Education (MoNE) Statistics (2015). National Education Statistics. Retrieved online from http://sgb.meb.gov.tr/meb_iys_dosyalar/2016_03/30044345_meb_istatistikleri_orgun_egitim_2015_2016.pdf.

Neuendorf, K.A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Noddings, N. (2013). *Education and democracy in the 21st century*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Q*ualitative research and evaluation methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Piaget, J. (1954). The construction of reality in children (M. Cook, Trans.). New York: Ballantine Books.

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.

Sassen, S. (2002). Towards post-national and denationalized citizenship. In E. Isin & B. Turner (Eds.) *Handbook of citizenship studies*. London: Thousand Oaks.

Şenses, F. (2012). Turkey's experience with neoliberal policies since 1980 in retrospect and prospect. *New Perspectives on Turkey, 47*, 11-31.

Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for information. 22(2),* 63-75.

Sıcak, A. & Arsal, Z. (2013). Evaluation of the lesson unit of let's learn about the world of organisms in the elementary school fifth-grade course of science and technology with respect to the educational criticism model. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences,* 157-175.

Şahan, G. & Tural, A. (2018). Evaluation of human rights, citizenship and democracy course by teachers' vision. *World Journal of Education*, *8*(2), 46-53.

Tarba-Ceylan, D. & Irzık, G. (2004). Human rights issues in textbooks: The Turkish case. Istanbul: History Foundation of Turkey Publications.

Tibbitts, F. (2015). *Curriculum Development and Review for Democratic Citizenship and Human Rights Education.* UNESCO Publishing. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002343/234386e.pdf.

Toprak, E. & Demir, S. B. (2017). İlkokul 4. sınıf "insan hakları, yurttaşlık ve demokrasi" dersinde yaşanan sorunların sınıf öğretmenleri tarafından değerlendirilmesi. *Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *17*(4), 2160-2179.

Tüzün, G. (2009). *Ders kitaplarında insan hakları II: Tarama sonuçları*. İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Ülger, M., Dombaycı, M.A. & Feyzioğlu, Y. (2015). *İlköğretim 4 İnsan hakları, Vatandaşlık ve Demokrasi.* Ankara: MEB.

Ulubey, Ö. & Gözütok, D. (2015). Future citizenship, democracy and human rights education with creative drama and other interactive teaching methods. *Education and Science,* 40 (182), 87-109.

Ünal, I. (2004). Çokdilli, çokkültürlü toplumlarda eğitim (Komisyon raporu). In *4. Demokratik Eğitim Kurultayı, 1,* Ankara: Eğitim-Sen Yayınları,

Üstel, F. (2014). *Makbul vatandaşın peşinde: II. meşrutiyet'ten bugüne vatandaşlık eğitimi.* Ankara: İletişim.

Yıldırım, A., & Şimsek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Ankara: Seçkin.

Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods* (5th Ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

6. UZUN ÖZET

Bu çalışma, 2015-2016 eğitim-öğretim yılında uygulanmaya başlanmış olan ilkokul dördüncü sınıf İnsan Hakları, Demokrasi ve Yurttaşlık öğretim programını Sinop ili bağlamında değerlendirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu çalışmanın gerçekleştirilmesinin üç temel gerekçesi bulunmaktadır; öncelikle söz konusu öğretim programı ilk kez 2015-2016 öğretim yılında ayrı bir ders olarak ilkokul programında yer almıştır; bunun yanı sıra öğretim programı uygulanmadan önce herhangi bir alan testine tabi tutulmadığı görülmektedir. Bunlara ek olarak program yayınlandığından beri sahip olduğu felsefeye, öğretmen yeterliliklerine ve program kapsamında hazırlanmış ders materyalinin öğrencilerin bilişsel gelişim düzeyine uygunluğuna dair bir takım eleştirilere konu olmaktadır. Örneğin, insan hakları eğitimi üzerine çalışan bir sivil toplum örgütü olan İnsan Hakları Eğitimi Ortak Çalışma Ağı raporuna göre, insan hakları kavramının evrenselliği bağlamında oldukça sorunlu olan "biz" kavramı hem müfredatta hem de ders materyalinde birçok kez vurgulanmıştır. Ayrıca yazılan ders kitabının hedefleri, içeriği, öğretim yöntemleri açısından öğrencilerin bilişsel düzeylerine uygun olmadığı iddia edilmektedir. Son olarak, bu proje kapsamında sınırlı sayıda öğretmene yönelik bir hizmet içi eğitim verilmiştir ve 247.000 öğretmenden 385'i eğitime katılmıştır. Bu nedenle, ilkokul öğretmenlerinin çoğunluğu hizmet içi eğitime katılamamıştır. Dolayısıyla, öğretmenlerin nitelik ve yetkinlik açısından, insan hakları, demokrasi ve yurttaşlık programını ayrı bir ders olarak vermek için hazır olup olmadıkları üzerine bir takım eleştiriler bulunmaktadır. Bu temel sebeplerle bağlantılı olarak çalışmada; öğretim programında tanımlanmış olan insan hakları kavramının evrenselliği, öğretim programının kazanımlarının, içeriğinin, öğretim materyallerinin ve yöntemlerinin öğrencilerin bilişsel gelişim düzeyi açısından uygunluğu; son olarak da öğretmenlerin bu ders içeriğini öğretebilme konusundaki yeterlilikleri incelenmiştir.

Çalışmada, gerçek durum çalışması yöntemi, nitel araştırma yaklaşımı ile yürütülmüştür. Veri, doküman analizi -öğretim programı ve ders materyalinin analizi-; sekiz-saat sınıf içi gözlem ve yedi öğretmen ve altı uzman -üç konu uzmanı, iki proje koordinatörü ve Temel Eğitim Bölümünde çalışmakta olan bir akademisyen- ile yapılan yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşmeler yoluyla toplanmıştır.

Çalışmada, program değerlendirme modeli olarak Eisner'in Eğitsel Uzmanlık/Eleştiri Modeli kullanılmıştır ve bu modelin seçilmesinin üç temel gerekçesi vardır. Öncelikle, araştırmanın temel amacı programın insan haklarının evrenselliğine uygunluğunu, programın ve ders materyalinin öğrencilerin bilişsel düzeyine ve hazırbulunuşluğuna uygunluğunu ve son olarak öğretmenlerin bu programı uygulamak için ne kadar hazır olduklarını değerlendirmektedir. Buradaki soru, programın birçok farklı açıdan uygunluğunu ya da öğretmen yeterliliklerini kimin değerlendirebileceğidir ki bu sorunun cevabı bizi, temelde uzman görüşüne dayanan Eisner'ın Eğitsel Uzmanlık/Eleştiri Modeli'ne yönlendirmiştir. İkinci olarak, yine araştırmanın amaçları ile uyumlu olarak kapsamlı ve derinlikli bir bakış açısına ihtiyaç olduğu düşünülmüştür ve bu doğrultuda geleneksel ve sadece nicel verilere dayalı bir anlayışa karşı çıkıp, nitel ve derinlikli verilerin öneminin altını çizen Eisner'in program değerlendirme bakış açısı temel alınmıştır. Son olarak ise, Eisner'a göre program değerlendirme uzmanı daha kapsamlı bir değerlendirme yapabilmek adına hem içerden bir gözlemci hem de dışardan bir uzman olarak hareket edebilmelidir. Bu iki rolü de yerine getirebilmek ve programı kapsamlı olarak değerlendirebilmek için Eisner'in program değerlendirme çerçevesinin oldukça uygun olduğu ve ayrıca program değerlendirme uzmanlarına bu bağlamda bir özgürlük alanı bıraktığı düşünülerek bu modelin uygulanmasının daha anlamlı olduğuna karar verilmiştir. Bu doğrultuda, modelin buna benzer değerlendirme çalışmalarında kullanılabileceği düşünülmektedir.

Veri, üzerinde çalışılan duruma dair detayları araştırma soruları doğrultusunda betimlemek amacı ile tümdengelimsel içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılarak çözümlenmiştir. İki araştırmacı tarafından ayrı ayrı kodlanan görüşme ve sınıf gözlem verilerinin değerleyici güvenirliği MAXQDA 18.0.8 kullanılarak hesaplanmıştır. Analiz sonuçları, görüşme verilerinin analiz sonuçları için %88.89, sınıf gözlem verileri analiz sonuçları için ise %84.62 oranında değerleyici güvenirlik sağlandığını ortaya koymuştur.

Görüşmeler daha önce belirlenen temalar doğrultusunda kodlanmıştır. Bu temalar şöyledir: (1) programın felsefesi; (2) insan hakları kavramının evrenselliği; (3) yurttaşlık kavramı; (4) kazanımların uygunluğu; (5) içeriğin uygunluğu; (6) öğretim yöntemlerinin uygunluğu; (7) öğretmenin eğitimi ihtiyacı ve (8) öğretmen zorlukları. Sınıf-içi gözlemler ise dört tema doğrultusunda kodlanmıştır: (1) öğrencilerin tepkileri; (2) öğrencilerin zorlukları; (3) öğretim yöntemi ve (4) öğretmen zorlukları. Bu temalar ışığında araştırma soruları da göz önünde bulundurularak elde edilen bulgular ortaya konmuştur.

Araştırma sonuçları, öğretim programında yer alan kazanımlar ve içeriğin insan hakları kavramının evrenselliği ile bağdaştığını; aynı zamanda öğretim ve değerlendirme yöntemlerinin programın felsefesi (yapılandırmacılık) ile örtüştüğünü göstermiştir. Ancak, bulgular resmi program ile programa ait ders materyali arasında ciddi tutarsızlıklar olduğunu göstermektedir. Ders materyalinin; içerdiği felsefe, konular, öğretim metotları ve yazımında kullanılan dil açısından programın amaçları ile uyuşmadığı gözlenmiştir. Program, yapılandırmacı ve demokratik bir anlayışa sahip iken, ders materyalinin daha geleneksel bir bakış açısı ile hazırlandığı; bunun ise uygulamada ciddi tutarsızlıklara sebebiyet verdiği gözlenmiştir. Uzman görüşleri de bu tutarsızlığı doğrulamakta; ders materyalinin insan haklarının evrenselliği, aktif vatandaşlık ve demokrasi kavramları açısından problemli ve tartışmalı olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, ders materyalinin öğrencilerin bilişsel gelişim düzeyi açısından da uygun olmadığı uzmanlar tarafından belirtilmiştir. Ders kitabında öğretim tekniği olarak yalnızca soru-cevap tekniğinin kullanıldığı gözlenmiştir ve kullanılan soruların niteliği ve niceliğine dair de

eleştiriler mevcuttur. Uzmanlar, soru-cevap tekniğine bağlı bir öğretim yönteminin bu yaş düzeyindeki öğrencilerin ilgisini dağıtabileceğini, bunun yerine öğrencilerin eleştirel düşünme becerilerini de geliştirebilecek daha interaktif yöntemlerin kullanılabileceğini vurgulamışlardır. Gözlem sonuçları, kullanılan soru cevap tekniğinin ve belirlenen soruların hem nicelik hem de nitelik bakımından öğrencilerin ilgisini toplamada ve öğrencilerin eleştirel düşünme becerilerini geliştirmede yetersiz kaldığını doğrulamıştır.

Sonuç olarak, resmi program ile uygulanan program arasındaki fark, öğretmenlerin bu dersi vermeye yeterince hazırlıklı olmamaları ve alan testinin uygulanmamış olması uzmanlar tarafından eleştirilen noktalardır. Sınıf-içi gözlem ve görüşme bulguları bu görüşleri destekler niteliktedir.