Education and Science

Original Article

Vol 50 (2025) No 222 99-128

A Delphi Study to Determine the Dimensions of Democratic Citizenship Competencies for Secondary School Students *

Ali Haydar Akarsu [1], Kaya Yılmaz [2]

Abstract

Global developments significantly affect countries' citizenship education policies and the citizenship competencies that students should acquire. This makes it essential to develop students' democratic citizenship competencies. In this context, the research aims to determine the democratic citizenship competencies necessary for secondary school students to participate in public life in a democratic country as active individuals. A mixed method was used in the research. The Delphi technique was utilized, and purposive sampling was used to increase the diversity of participants and data. Delphi panelists were selected from academicians, independent researchers, school administrators, and teachers directly interested in citizenship, citizenship education, democratic citizenship/citizenship education, democracy, and human rights. Sixty-one panelists participated in the 1st Delphi round, 8 in the confirmation round, and 44 in the 2nd Delphi round. In the 1st Delphi round, data was collected with a single open-ended question and analyzed through descriptive analysis. Thus, for democratic citizenship, competencies in line with the panelists' opinions, knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and tendencies were determined, and dimensions related to the subject were created. The dimensions determined in the 1st Delphi round and the themes, categories, and items forming these dimensions were presented to the panelists for their opinions in the approval round. As a result of the approval round, the dimensions forming democratic citizenship competencies were rearranged. In order to reach a consensus, the items forming the dimensions of Democratic Citizenship Education (DCE) were presented to the panelists for scoring in the 2nd Delphi round. The quantitative data obtained in this round were analyzed using the SPSS 25 program statistical analyses. In the study, three dimensions (cognitive, affectivel, and skill) reflecting the Democratic Citizenship Competencies (DCC) were determined. It is seen that the dimensions forming the DCC

Keywords

Democracy
Democratic education
Citizenship
Democratic citizenship
Democratic citizenship competencies
Delphi Technique

Article Info

Received: 10.06.2023
Accepted: 09.27.2024
Published Online: 04.28.2025

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2025.13221

* This article is derived from Ali Haydar Akarsu's PhD dissertation entitled "Developing the democratic citizenship competencies for secondary school students", conducted under the supervision of Kaya Yılmaz.

[1] Recep Tayyip Erdoğan University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Education, Türkiye, alihaydar.akarsu@erdogan.edu.tr

[2] Sivas Cumhuriyet University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Education, Türkiye, kayayilmaz@cumhuriyet.edu.tr

are related to multiculturalism, understanding, dialogue, communication, establishing connections, democratic participation, moral responsibility, critical understanding, independent learning, mutual respect, and tolerance. The dimensions determined in line with the DCC can be used as an analytical tool by those preparing the curriculum, administrators, and teachers. These dimensions can also guide the determination of the direction and goals of DCE. Teachers can benefit from these dimensions developed in their in-class and out-of-class teaching planning, implementation, and evaluation stages.

Introduction

In times of crisis, there is an increasing need for DCE based on democracy, peace, social justice, and human rights (Audiger, 1996). Problems such as globalization and migration, global injustice and inequalities, declining civic and political participation, the end of the Cold War, the rise of anti-democratic racist movements, and the inability of young people to play a fully effective and participatory role in society due to their lack of knowledge, skills, and experience (youth deficit) have been identified by researchers as essential components accelerating the transition to DCE (Osler & Starkey, 2006). National belonging, loyalty, minorities, ethnic terrorist incidents, multiculturalism, failure of environmental policies, the resurgence of nationalist movements, and increase in authoritarianism (Banks, 2011; Council of Europe, 2018 Kaya, 2003; Kymlicka & Norman, 2012, p. 185; Soysal & Wong, 2007) individualism, bad social habits of young people, urban violence, dislike of European politics, tensions between native Europeans and immigrants (Leeman & Reid, 2006; cited in Veugelers, 2007) are seen as essential factors that create the need for DCE.

As many researchers have argued, this need makes it more critical than ever to equip young people with the knowledge and skills to resist negativity and anti-democratic forces (Slaughter, 2017). With globalization, interdependencies in the political, social, and economic spheres and the obligations imposed on individuals and states by the global competition process have necessitated a transition from traditional citizenship to democratic citizenship, which is more active, participatory, and consensual (Özpolat, 2009). These developments have transformed citizenship education, which typically focuses on national issues and institutions (Osler & Starkey, 2006), due to the diversity of problems threatening democracy. This transformation has accelerated with the establishment and effectiveness of supranational or supranational political structures such as the European Union (EU), the United Nations (UN), and the Council of Europe (CoE) (Şen, 2019b). Thus, the concept of citizenship has ceased to be merely a status that regulates the rights and duties between the state and its legally bound citizens and has been defined as a comprehensive concept with local, regional, and global dimensions in addition to its national discourses (Dumitru, 2017; Önal, 2019). With globalization, the concept of citizenship has transcended national borders, gained a transnational character, and settled in a context other than its traditional dimension. Especially in Europe and North America, multiculturalist (Banks, 2011; Kymlicka, 2008), democratic (Birzea, 2000; Hess & McAvoy, 2015; Parker, 2003; Parker & Jarolimek, 1984), post-structuralist (Pykett, 2007; Wood, 2014), critical (Apple, 2017; Giroux, 1980; Johnson & Morris, 2010; McLaren, 2011; Veugelers, 2007), global citizenship (Osler & Starkey, 2005), and cosmopolitan citizenship (Osler & Starkey, 2005). These new perspectives have made it essential not only that citizenship should be a naturally acquired right but also that citizens with the competencies to exercise these rights should be educated.

Along with these conceptualizations, some social scientists who adopt the democratic citizenship approach criticize traditional citizenship education and argue that in citizenship education, it is not passive/good/adaptive students who think critically and explain socio-political events with a critical perspective; rather than passive/good/conforming students, but rather individuals who think critically and explain socio-political events from a critical perspective, take the initiative, use decision-

making mechanisms, solve problems, are active, are willing to make changes, participate politically, defend human rights and social justice, contribute to social development, respect themselves, others and the environment, are open to differences and communication with others, and possess knowledge, skills, and values (Banks, 2008; Branson & Quigley, 1998; Doğanay, 2008; Giroux, 1980; McLaren, 2011; Kerr, 2003; Parker, 2003; Parker, 2018; Ross, 2008; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004). These current discourses on citizenship education emphasize democratic citizenship, which promotes democracy, human rights, and active participation.

The need for active citizenship practices in many countries has increased the interest in DCE worldwide (Cowan & Maitles, 2016). This need has been reflected in educational reforms in countries as diverse as the UK, USA, Spain, Australia, Korea, and Taiwan (Naval, Print, & Veldhuis, 2002). The limited reflections of the efforts to democratize educational content and practices were seen in the new curriculum that started to be implemented in Turkey in 2005.

Democratic Citizenship Education: A Brief Background for Turkey

Harris (2005) defines DCE as developing students' ability to act independently by focusing on individuals' rights, responsibilities, and roles locally, nationally, and globally. Accordingly, DCE should prepare students to address the complex aspects of democratic life (Castro & Knowles, 2017, p. 288) and to create and sustain a culture of democracy (Biesta, 2007). Awareness of fundamental values such as human rights and freedoms, the rule of law, and the equality of difference, and the strengthening and dissemination of a democratic culture based on these values are stated as essential goals of DCE (Council of Europe, 2010; O'Shea, 2001-2004).

Democratic citizens are defined as people who know, exercise, and protect their rights, take active roles in daily life, are open to differences, and have a high participatory awareness. Therefore, researchers (Print, 2013; Veldhuis, 1997; Veugelers, 2007) who have come together in the European Union (EU) to create transnational citizenship that strengthens social cohesion among citizens and develops a critical spirit have agreed that there is an urgent need for DCE, especially in the European context, to build a diverse, reconciliatory and multicultural society (Naval et al., 2002). Considering these initiatives, the Council of Europe (2018) published the Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture to identify competencies for democratic culture with the contributions of researchers from many European countries. In this context, an attempt was made to develop some competencies for living together as equals in culturally diverse democratic societies. The publication proposed a model with a total of 20 competencies in the categories of (a) values, (b) attitudes, (c) skills, (d) knowledge and critical understanding. This model considers DCE and has been adopted in European countries, Turkey, and others.

Until the European Union (EU) membership application in 1987, citizenship education in Turkey was mainly used effectively to build a 'nation-state,' carried out with the classical understanding of citizenship theory based on national identity (Caymaz, 2008; Üstel, 2019). Since then, the monist and national identity-based understanding of citizenship education has come up for discussion, and new searches have begun at the state level. MoNE tried to renew its citizenship education program by participating in the democratic citizenship projects of the United Nations (UN) and the Council of Europe (Şen & Starkey, 2017). As a result of these efforts, the Citizenship Studies course was renamed Citizenship and Human Rights Education in 1995. This course was abolished after the 2005 curriculum reform, and citizenship education was introduced in the Social Studies course. In 2010, a new course called Citizenship and Democracy Education was added to the curriculum, but this course was also abolished with the 4+4+4-based education reform in 2012 (MoNE, 2012). In 2018, although citizenship education is taught in the Human Rights, Citizenship, and Democracy Course in the 4th grade of primary education and in the Law and Justice Course, which is taught as an elective course in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades, it is mainly integrated with the Social Studies Course in grades 5-6-7 (MoNE, 2018).

On the other hand, the *'Ministry of National Education Directive on Democracy Education and School Assemblies,'* which encourages participatory citizenship and supports democratic school culture to a great extent, was repealed in 2019 with the decision of the Board of Education.

The Ministry of National Education translated the Democratic Culture Competencies Reference Framework into Turkish with the financial support of the European Union and the Council of Europe (Council of Europe, 2018). In cooperation with the Council of Europe, MoNE initiated a project establishing primary education institutions in 10 pilot provinces and 110 schools. This project aims to embed a democratic school culture that encompasses universal core values and fundamental rights and freedoms into the education system and to strengthen democratic culture practices by involving students, school staff, and families in the project process (MoNE, 2019).

Despite some positive strides, research results show that the understanding of citizenship in Turkey until 2005 was shaped around the understanding of passive, compliant, and acceptable citizens (Çayır, 2010; Kancı, 2008; İnal, 2019). In 2005, with the changes made in the curricula based on constructivist learning theory, the aim of raising active and effective citizens gained priority (MoNE, 2005). In the following years, the importance of raising students as active citizens has been maintained locally, nationally, and globally (MoNE, 2018). Although the 2005 constructivist curriculum aimed to raise active and effective citizens (Doğanay, 2012), many studies indicate that citizenship education was generally carried out with a centralist understanding and a uniform curriculum in the post-2005 period (Aratemur-Çimen & Beyhan, 2018; Çayır, 2010; Elkatmış, 2013; İnal, 2019; İnce, 2012; İpek, 2011; Kancı, 2008; Şen, 2019a; Şen & Starkey, 2017; Yiğit, 2017).

Why Democratic Citizenship Education? Theoretical and Practical Explanations

Why is there a need for Democratic Citizenship Education? The dynamics within countries make answering this question both differentiating and difficult. Due to the contested nature of citizenship, many countries are still in the process of answering the question: *Why Democratic Citizenship Education?* This research is an attempt to continue this search for DCE.

Turkey, where ethnic and cultural diversity is already high, has accepted Syrian refugees, as well as migrants from Middle Eastern and Asian countries, as well as war victims displaced after the Russia-Ukraine war, in the last decade. This has made Turkish society more diverse in language, culture, and ethnicity. Secondary school students need to understand this diversity, develop skills for living together, and have values centered on peace and justice. In this context, addressing students' democratic citizenship competencies with an approach that transforms diversity and differences into richness is a critical need for Turkey's future and the development of a culture of democracy.

Research on citizenship education shows that the understanding of citizenship education in Turkey focuses more on raising 'compliant citizens' and emphasizes elements such as obedience, etiquette, responsibility, and discipline (Çayır, 2014; Gürses, 2010; Gök, 2004; İnce, 2012; Şen, 2019a). In this context, citizens are expected to fulfill duties such as military service, paying taxes, and participating in elections. Themes such as self-sacrifice, obedience, and loyalty are frequently repeated and inculcated (Üstel, 2019). In addition, it is seen that a citizenship education approach that postpones rights and freedoms or reduces them to the level of knowledge is dominant (Çayır, 2014; İnce, 2012). This situation provides essential clues as to why democratic citizenship education should be developed.

In addition to the official understanding, dimensions such as educational programs and textbooks, teacher perception, and classroom practices are other critical elements that determine the quality of citizenship education. These elements can affect students' internalization of democratic values.

There is evidence that the content of curricula and textbooks do not sufficiently promote democratic understanding. Analyzing the 2018 Social Studies Curriculum, Şen (2019b) concluded that the curriculum reflects the characteristics of traditional citizenship education intensively and modern citizenship education to a limited extent. 'The findings of the analysis showed that the curriculum in question is a curriculum that emphasizes knowledge-level learning, neglects teaching students citizenship skills, is timid about recognizing social differences, is based on a de-politicized concept of citizenship, passes over the concept of human rights with a single problematic reference, does not aim to increase students' interest in socio-political problems, and prioritizes the collective (state, country, nation, etc.) over the individual' (Şen, 2019b, p. 20). In addition, the fact that education programs and course materials do not sufficiently include democratic values limits students' critical thinking and active participation skills (Kuş & Yakar, 2021). Ersoy (2016) reported that the content of the Citizenship and Democracy Education Course, which is the last independent citizenship course taught in secondary schools, is not sufficient to provide students with citizenship competencies, the course is not given the necessary importance, and the satisfaction level of teachers and students is low. In addition, it is pointed out in different studies that although issues reflecting modern citizenship education, such as gender equality and discrimination, are included in this course and human rights documents are referred to, the silence on multiculturalism is maintained (Çayır, 2010; Elkatmış, 2013).

On the other hand, it is stated that textbooks generally contain content that glorifies the authority of the state and national unity. This situation has been observed to limit students' critical thinking and evaluation of different perspectives (İpek, 2011). İpek (2011), who examined the suitability of social studies textbooks, which claim to raise influential citizens, to the objectives of the curriculum, concluded that the content in the textbooks in the dimensions of democracy, human rights, and economic relations is mainly theoretical. Gemalmaz (2004) concluded that in many textbooks on human rights, freedoms are not given enough space and that responsibilities to authority and expectations of loyalty are prioritized over human rights and freedoms. Similarly, Gök (2004) concluded that duties and responsibilities are covered intensively in textbooks. Çayır (2004) underlines that even in textbooks prepared for citizenship and human rights education, democracy is vaguely defined, and democracy and participation are reduced mainly to electoral politics. In another study, Çayır states that textbooks prepared according to the new curriculum are based on nationalism, national identity, and otherness (Çayır, 2010). Faiz and Karasu Avcı (2018) examined the skills and values in the *'active citizenship'* learning domain of 4th and 5th grade Social Studies textbooks. They found that cooperation and social participation skills were emphasized intensively. Although these two skills are essential indicators of democratic citizenship, research examining the impact of these skills at the practice level is limited. In the same study, responsibility was the most emphasized value at both grade levels.

Teachers should use democratic teaching methods in classroom practices. Ersoy (2016) concluded that teachers do not find themselves sufficient in citizenship and democracy education and do not have an opinion about which subjects they can teach and how. Akyıldız (2016) reported that social studies teachers prefer question-answer, case study, demonstration, discussion, role-playing, role-playing, and lecture methods in the teaching activities they organize to teach the value of respect for rights and freedoms. He concluded that they gave less space to drama, brainstorming, and project methods that enable students to work in cooperation and solidarity and make them active (p.1282). Berkant and Aslan (2015) reported that teachers generally use traditional methods and techniques in their classrooms due to time constraints, curriculum intensity, and class sizes. Kuş and Yakar (2021) concluded that teachers did not include practices to develop students' high-level cognitive skills, such as critical thinking and problem-solving. Observations during the lessons show that teachers use traditional methods such as question-answer and lecture, while discussion and collaborative practices are rarely used. In a recent study, Duman (2023) found similar results: social studies teachers used

traditional methods and techniques. This situation causes students to develop passive, non-participatory citizenship behaviors and prevents them from developing democratic citizenship competencies.

These findings show that curriculum, textbooks, and teacher practices do not sufficiently support democratic lifestyles and values. Social environment and cultural factors also reinforce this situation. Centralized and monist approaches that dominate large segments of society prevent the spread of democratic understanding (Oğuz, 2007).

When the research results are evaluated, it can be said that a holistic understanding of democratic citizenship is needed in Turkey. However, the democratic way of life requires citizens who believe in democratic values, have knowledge about the meaning of democracy and democratic society, do democratic things (Doğanay, 2008; Parker, 2008), make accessible and independent decisions, and are rational and democratic (Biesta, 2007). However, these citizens do not emerge spontaneously. It is necessary to raise individuals who can govern themselves and cope with school difficulties (Parker & Beck, 2017, p. 60). Although countries' political, economic, social, and cultural differences differentiate citizenship education's purpose, scope, and quality, many social scientists think that schools and other educational institutions are essential in preparing individuals for a democratic culture. Dewey (1916, 2020) argues that schools are areas where democracy is practiced; Parker (1995) argues that schools create democratic minds; Callan (1997) argues that schools create good citizens; Giroux (1998) argues that schools should prepare individuals for democracy; Gutmann (1999) argues that education prepares citizens to reproduce society consciously; Biesta (2007) argues that schools play an essential role in the formation of democratic citizenship and the creation of a democratic society; Soder, Goodlad, and McMannon (2001), and Apple and Beane (2016) argue that schools develop democratic values in young people. Print (2013) emphasizes that a democratic and sustainable future depends on educating young people in a qualified manner.

There are essential findings in national and international literature indicating that citizenship education should be designed in a way that will enable individuals to participate in social, political, and economic life actively (Crick, 1999; Doğanay, 2012) and help them acquire democratic knowledge, skills, values and attitudes (Audiger, 2000; Council of Europe, 2018; Biesta, 2007; Branson & Quigley; 1998; Burns, 2002; Carretero, Haste, & Bermudez, 2016, Doğanay, 2008; Güven, 2005; Hoskins, 2013; Izgar, 2013; O'Shea, 2001-2004; Parker & Jarolimek, 1984; Print, 2013; Remy, 1979; Şimşek, Doymuş, Şimşek, & Özdemir, 2006; Veldhuis, 1997; Veugelers, 2007). In these studies, the importance of providing individuals with knowledge, skills, values, attitudes and tendencies towards democratic life in the construction, strengthening and maintenance of citizenship is frequently emphasized. It is stated that this knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes can be achieved mainly through a practical and democratic understanding of citizenship education (Biesta, 2007; Doğanay, 2012; Print, 2013).

These studies in the literature increase our understanding of EDC but also draw attention to the need for more research specific to Turkey. The characteristics that democratic citizens are expected to have are not a subject on which a consensus has been reached due to the differences in societies. Based on the assumption that this fundamental problem has a philosophical, historical, cultural, sociological, critical, and pedagogical substructure (Parker, 2008, p. 65), this research is based on the discussions on which democratic citizenship competencies middle school students should acquire in Turkey, a democratic country, at the level of democratic knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and tendencies. Determining a set of competencies for individuals at the middle school level is a complex and challenging process. However, this research is based on the claim that citizenship education is essential in preparing students for democracy as individuals of the age. Therefore, the research seeks to answer the question, "According to academics, independent researchers, teachers, and middle school administrators, what democratic knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and tendencies should 8th-grade middle school students in Turkey have?"

Method

This study was conducted using mixed methods, which allows qualitative and quantitative research methods to be used together. The mixed method involves the process of collecting data, analyzing, combining, and drawing conclusions from these data by using the strengths of quantitative and qualitative research approaches together in order to understand and answer a scientific problem (Creswell, 2003; Johnson & Onwugbuzie, 2004; Nagy & Biber, 2010). The study used an *exploratory sequential design* to explore phenomena and identify themes and categories. This design can be used to collect satisfactory qualitative data and develop quantitative measurement tools or to shape categorical information while collecting quantitative data (Creswell, 2012). In this context, the Delphi technique was used in this research, which was conducted to determine and reach a consensus on the knowledge, skills, values, and tendencies that secondary school students need to be involved in public life as democratic citizens.

Delphi Technique

The Delphi technique is a technique that allows qualitative and quantitative data to be collected simultaneously (Skulmoski, Hartman, & Krahn, 2007; Sprenkle & Piercy, 2005). In this study, qualitative data were collected in 1st Delphi round, and quantitative and qualitative data were collected together in the confirmation and Delphi rounds II. Since there is a continuous relationship between the phases, data collection tools were associated (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). In this process, in 1st Delphi round, a comprehensive answer was sought to a single open-ended question expressing the problem. In the approval and the second Delphi rounds, quantitative and qualitative data were collected but analyzed separately. Accordingly, quantitative data were used to support and build consensus on the initial qualitative findings obtained in the first phase of the research. In the research, qualitative and quantitative data were brought together with a pragmatic approach,, interpreted and discussed together in the process (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2015).

The Delphi technique consists of successive rounds of questionnaires to collect expert opinions systematically to obtain the most reliable opinion on a particular subject (Dalkey, 2002; Dalkey & Helmer, 1963). The Delphi technique has three characteristics: *(1) confidentiality/anonymity, (2) refresh/repeat and controlled feedback, and (3) a statistical combination of expert responses* (Sackman, 1975). These three features of the Delphi technique were utilized in the research process as follows:

a. *Confidentiality/anonymity* is related to keeping the identities of the experts participating in the research confidential (Sackman, 1975) and the panelists not knowing each other (Rowe & Wright, 1999) so that they can freely express their views and opinions throughout the process without feeling group pressure and change their opinions when necessary. In this context, the names of all participants in the Delphi rounds were kept confidential, and all correspondence was made through individual e-mail addresses. The Delphi rounds were conducted with a closed questionnaire system in which none of the participants could monitor each other. Since the panelists answered the questions privately, the influence of other dominant people in the group was minimized in this way (Clayton, 1997). In this way, it was possible for different ideas to emerge more quickly and innovative ideas to emerge (Dalkey, 2002).

b. *Iteration/repetition and controlled feedback* refer to using successive rounds of questionnaires in the Delphi technique (Dalkey, 1969; Rowe & Wright, 1999). Therefore, iteration/repetition and controlled feedback relate to repeatedly sending the questionnaire to the panelists until a consensus is reached (Rowe & Wright, 1999). In the data collection process of this study, controlled feedback was provided as statistical data on the opinions of the other panelists were summarized by the researchers in each Delphi round and shared with the others regularly. All panelists could revisit their views based on this feedback from the beginning of the first round. Giving feedback to the panelists helped them to learn from each other (Clayton, 1997) and allowed new and different ideas to emerge (Dalkey, 2002).

c. *Statistical aggregation of expert responses* refers to the statistical aggregation of panelists' responses after repeated rounds and presenting the results as consensus (Rowe & Wright, 1999).

First Delphi Round

In the 1st Delphi Round, the question *"What competencies (knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, behaviors, dispositions, etc.) should students at the end of the 8th grade of secondary school in Turkey have in order to participate in public life as democratic citizens?"* was asked. The questions prepared through Survey (online Survey) were sent to each panelist through their e-mail addresses. In order to reveal the meaning of the text, the responses were carefully read from beginning to end, and the data were tried to be identified. Then, codes were created by reading the texts line by line with an inductive approach (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, p. 89). Using inductive coding and constant comparison, repeated patterns were identified by staying within the texts' context (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Thus, in Round I, panelist answers, statements, and comments were transformed into items that would form a meaningful whole. Each meaningful part of the text (word, sentence, and paragraph) was coded in this process. This analytical strategy allowed focusing on the meanings expressed by the panelists and categorizing them. After the coding process, the relationships between the codes were examined. The codes that emerged in the first stage were grouped under specific categories (basic unit of analysis) according to their similarities and differences, and patterns and themes in the data were identified from these categories. Research findings were reached and interpreted as a result of this analysis process. At the end of the first round, 321 items reflecting the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and dispositions that students are expected to have as democratic citizens were written.

Approval Round

The dimensions that emerged in the approval round were built on the data obtained from the panelists in the 1st Delphi round. The first analysis results, which were formed at the end of the first round and expressed to the DCC, were sent to the panelists as a Word document so that they could make changes if they wished. Panelists were asked to review the competency items and check the appropriateness of the themes and categories, the relevance of the items to the themes and codes, the clarity of each item, and whether they could be combined with other items. The approval round was also used as a confidential scoring tool. If deemed necessary, panelists were expected to make minor changes to the items or rephrase them and make suggestions about irrelevant items. If there were consensus on the themes, categories, and items, they would be sent to the panelists for scoring in the second Delphi round. Greene's (2007) principles of *'complementarity' and 'development'* were used in the approval round. The qualitative data obtained in the 1st Delphi round were elaborated, enriched, explained, clarified, and complemented in this round.

On the other hand, to clarify and elaborate the findings and evaluate the different dimensions of the issue, the results of the 1st Delphi round were tried to be developed in the confirmation round. In the confirmation round, most of the panelists (8/9) reached a consensus on categories and themes. In line with the panelists' feedback, some items were merged, some items were slightly modified, and some items were changed as suggested by the panelists. Thus, the number of items, which was 321 in the 1st Delphi round, was reduced to 258 after the Confirmation round. After this stage, the dimensions reflecting the DCC were ready for the panelists to score in the second Delphi round.

Second Delphi Round

The second Delphi round was built on the data obtained from the 1st Delphi round and the approval round. At the end of the approval round, the dimensions determined with the panelists' feedback, corrections, and contributions were created as a 7-point Likert scale in Survey and sent to the panelists to score, and quantitative data were collected. On the other hand, a blank text box was added under each theme and category so panelists could reflect on their comments, suggestions, and motivations. Thus, it was possible to receive instant feedback on the dimensions reflecting citizenship competencies and to make corrections at the end of each round. In this way, in cases where quantitative data were dysfunctional (expression disorder, meaning shift, missing expression, misspelling, etc.), panelists could support quantitative data with qualitative data that would provide more meaningful results with their comments, opinions, and suggestions. At this stage, quantitative analysis methods were used to analyze the data. The written feedback given by the panelists was used to rephrase the categories and related items.

The data obtained in the second Delphi round were used to complete and improve the dimensions of the DCC (Creswell, 2017; Greene, 2007), which were determined as a draft in the 1st

Delphi round. Although consensus was reached on all items in this round, 29 items were changed due to wording and semantic disorders in line with panelist comments, and five items were removed because they repeated each other. For example, P-14 (panelist), regarding the affective dimension item *"Adopting the common values of the society due to the principle of mutual loyalty,"* said, "Article 146 is not very clear, the community with which he is together may be a criminal organization. For this reason, the article may need to be revised and rewritten. *"It can be as participating in the community where he/she lives with democratic values."* His comment contributed to the amendment of the article, stating, *"Willingness to adopt the common values of the democratic society in which he lives."* This process was continued for the other 29 items. Quantitative data were used to test qualitative data, to increase reliability and validity, and to build consensus. The process that Greene (2007) refers to as completion and development was also used in Delphi round II.

Identification of Delphi Panelists

Delphi rounds are about getting expert opinions and reaching a consensus on these opinions. However, how these experts will be selected and who they will be is critical. Therefore, it is crucial to identify appropriate panelists using the Delphi technique (Hsu & Standford, 2007). In order to conduct a successful Delphi process, care was taken to select panelists from experts who could contribute to the research (Grisham, 2008). In line with the specific objectives of the research (Clayton, 1997), panelists were selected using purposive sampling (Cohen, Manion, and Morrison, 2011; Skulmoski et al., 2007). Instead of selecting a large number of participants, smaller groups of participants who are thought to have rich and in-depth knowledge on the subject were preferred (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2015; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008, p.107) in order to enable the discovery, explanation and in-depth study of events or phenomena (Patton, 2002). Accordingly, attention was paid to selecting panelists from different disciplines and fields, thus ensuring diversity (Linstone, 1975). Thus, care was taken to select panelists who represent possible diversity, difference, richness, and contrast (Patton, 2002). In order to take advantage of subjective and collective judgments, to seek the views of people with different expertise and experience, and to benefit from heterogeneous groups of participants (Linstone, 1975), Delphi panelists were selected from academics, independent researchers, school administrators, and teachers who were directly involved in citizenship, citizenship education, democratic citizenship/education, democracy, and human rights (Neuman, 2012). Descriptive information about the panelists involved in the Delphi rounds is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of Panelists Participating in Delphi Rounds According to Their Titles and Positions

			Round I	Approval Round	Round II
Questionnaire sent			**92**	**10**	**66**
Academician		Professor	6	2	5
		Associate Professor	8	1	7
		Assistant Professor	7	2	7
		Dr. Research assistant.	2	1	1
		Dr. Lecturer	1	1	1
Teacher	**MoNE**	Dr.	3	1	3
		Studying PhD	8	1	8
		Has a Master's degree	16		5
	Private school	Dr.			-
		Studying PhD	2	1	1
		Has a Master's degree	2		1
Independent researcher		Dr.	2		1
		Studying PhD	1		1
School	**Private school**	Dr.	1		1
Administrator	**MoNE**	Dr.	1		1
		Studying PhD	1		1
Completed questionnaire			**61**	**9**	**44**
Response rate			**%66,3**	**%90**	**%62,1**

Sixty-one panelists participated in the 1st Delphi round, 9 in the confirmation round, and 44 in the second Delphi round. As seen in Table 1, the panelists were of sufficient number and diversity. One of the most essential advantages of the Delphi technique is that it allows access to the knowledge, experience, and opinions of people working in different fields on a particular subject. In this context, 24 panelists conducting academic studies on citizenship education, democracy, and human rights were reached. In addition, 31 teachers from 6 different branches, three independent researchers, and three school administrators were included in the study as panelists.

In the 1st Delphi round, 24 academicians from 21 universities and ten different disciplines (philosophy, sociology, political science, history, communication sciences, international relations, social studies education, primary education, educational sciences, educational policies); 31 teachers from 15 different cities and six different branches, three school administrators, three independent researchers from different disciplines, 61panelists in total participated. In the confirmation round, two professors, one associate professor, 2 Assistant Professors, 2 Ph. Professors, one associate professor, 2 Dr. Lecturer, 1 Dr. Lect. Assist., 1 Dr. Research Assist. Gör. and nine people from 3 different cities, including 1 Dr. Teacher and 2 PhD teachers. In the second Delphi round, a total of 44 panelists, including 21 academics from 10 different disciplines from 17 different universities, 17 teachers from 12 different cities and five different branches, three school administrators, and two independent researchers, participated. Introductory information about the panelists is presented in Appendix 1.

Data Analysis

This study analyzed qualitative data using descriptive and quantitative data using statistical methods. According to the descriptive approach, the data obtained can be summarized and interpreted according to predetermined themes, or the data can be presented by considering the interview questions and dimensions revealed by the research questions (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008). In this study, codes, categories, and themes were created based on the answers obtained from the participants in the Delphi rounds. The research used descriptive analysis to examine and explain the qualitative data obtained and develop categories and themes to form broad ideas (Creswell, 2012). The study emphasized semantic associations to explain how the panelists described the expected DCC of middle school students. In this approach, three main stages were applied. These are *'description,' 'analysis,'* and *'interpretation.'* While description concerns what is said and what is revealed about the research question, analysis refers to uncovering themes and the meaning relationships between them through conceptual coding and classification. Interpretation, on the other hand, focuses on the meaning that emerges as a result of analysis by prioritizing meaning (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008).

In order to analyze the data, the data obtained through the open-ended question collected in the 1st Delphi round were read, organized, and prepared for descriptive analysis. At this stage, first, panelist opinions were tried to be described (Creswell, 2012). Second, a list of codes was created. Finally, the data were read several times, categories and themes were created, the meaning relationships between them were tried to be revealed, and the items were written in the last stage.

Delphi research aims to reveal characteristics such as originality, originality, difference, creativity, etc. (Dalkey, 2002). In this context, in the first stage of data analysis, it was considered necessary not to determine how many people said what but what was said itself and its semantic connotations. The codes were created by reaching a consensus with two different researchers. For this reason, frequencies and percentages were not considered when coding and quantifications were not included at this stage. By the nature of the research, the focus was on the essence of the idea (Johnson & Onwugbuzie, 2004; Patton 2002). As a result of the descriptive analysis, the percentage of agreement between the three coders was calculated as 91.00%. This rate is acceptable (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The data obtained from the 1st Delphi round were analyzed, and themes, categories, and items related to the dimensions that make up the DCC were determined. These dimensions were submitted to the opinions and approval of 9 panelists in the Delphi approval round. Thus, a second data set (quantitative + qualitative) was obtained. These data were analyzed again to improve the current draft

and used to finalize themes and categories (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008). Thus, the draft dimensions obtained at the end of the first round were ready to be evaluated in the second Delphi round.

In the approval round, scoring was done first of all. The scores obtained from the items *"not suitable," "can be used with correction,"* and "*can be used as it is*" were first calculated for each panelist and category. Finally, the ratio of each category to all panelists was calculated and interpreted. The approval round was also a critical stage where panelist opinions were collected. At this stage, the panelists' opinions, thoughts, and suggestions allowed the DCC dimensions to be clarified and made ready for the second Delphi round.

In the second Delphi round, the panelists were asked to score the dimensions reflecting the DCC using a 7-point Likert scale. In addition, after each competency statement, the panelists were allowed to evaluate the statements if they wished. The data collected in the second Delphi round were analyzed using the SPSS-25 statistical program and Excel.

Different criteria can be used to analyze data obtained from Delphi rounds. In order to determine the general judgments of experts, measures of central tendency such as median and mode can be used; measures of central dispersion such as standard deviation and interquartile difference (IQD) (Şahin, 2010) or both can be used together (Haltinner, 2008). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and complete the dimensions of DCC scored by the panelists in the 2nd Delphi round (Johnson & Christen, 2014, p. 451). For the data obtained at the end of the 2nd Delphi round, arithmetic mean ($\bar{X}$) and median (Md), which are measures of central tendency, standard deviation (SD), and interquartile difference (IQD), were calculated. The data analysis results based on frequency, mode, median, arithmetic mean, and standard deviation were compared with the consensus criterion. Thus, an attempt was made to reach a consensus on the items reflecting the dimensions. According to the consensus criterion preferred to be used in this study, in order to accept that an item has been agreed upon, the median must be ($5 \geq 5$), and the IQD value must be ($2.5 \leq 2.5$). In addition, the total percentage of responses in frequencies 5-7 must be 70% and above (Şahin, 2010). If these three criteria are met together, it is accepted that an item has been agreed upon. Since using these three criteria together weakens the possibility of easy acceptance of the items, this situation has been implemented to increase the item's reliability.

Validity and Reliability Studies

Validity is related to the causality between two variables and how the results can be generalized to other people and contexts (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). In this context, the coders read the participant statements obtained with the open-ended question in the 1st Delphi round several times to reach more accurate and objective statements. Most of the time, the research findings were tried to be made consistent and meaningful within themselves by using the participants' statements directly (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). In this way, unclear facts and events were tried to be determined and made understandable. Later, these data were presented to the panelists for confirmation in the approval round and the Second Delphi round until a consensus was reached (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008).

During the data analysis process, repetition of data was identified as a significant limitation. In order to combat these limitations, the process was continued by obtaining expert opinions. Another essential strategy used by the researchers to overcome this limitation was to let the data cool down and read it several times at specific intervals. In this way, repetitive and similar expressions were tried to be eliminated. The consensus of the researchers finalized the final decision on the meaning of some concepts. This way, it was tried to prevent the researchers' bias (Creswell & Poth, 2018).

Regularly obtaining expert opinions throughout the research process has significantly contributed to the research's validity. In this context, online meetings, telephone interviews, and e-mail exchanges were held with numerous experts at specific intervals from the time the data were collected until the completion of the research regarding the coding, organization, combination, meaningfulness of the data, evaluation of dimensions, analysis, and application of the method. These individuals made significant contributions to the emergence of the study and to increasing its validity.

The data obtained in the 1st Delphi round were objectively and systematically divided into meaningful parts and coded (Neuman, 2012), and themes and categories were created (Creswell, 2007). In the analysis process, the panelists' opinions were first coded separately. Then, in approximately 41 hours of Google Meet meetings held separately with both researchers for two months, categories and themes were created by comparing, discussing (Merriam, 2013), organizing, interpreting, and combining (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2008) the independently created codes. It was emphasized that the determined themes explained the obtained data meaningfully. In addition, the process of mutually examining the findings during the data review and interpretation stages contributed to the reliability of the research.

The Role of Researchers

The Delphi technique is new for the researchers. They are using it for the first time. Therefore, the researchers knew that the technique created some limitations for them. In order to overcome these limitations, first of all, a large number of theses and articles in the literature conducted with Delphi were examined. Two researchers who used the Delphi technique in their doctoral dissertations were constantly communicated with during the process. Interviews were conducted with one of them three times, the other four times via Google Meet, and several times via telephone. These interviews significantly improved the researchers' skills in using the Delphi technique. Another critical responsibility of the researchers in the Delphi process is to manage the process as a moderator. Therefore, panelists were contacted via personal e-mails instead of mass e-mails to organize the questionnaires and ensure anonymity. The first researcher played an essential role in rewriting the items in line with the panelists' responses and organizing and analyzing the data.

Another critical point is the difficulty of keeping the panelists in the process, as it is time-consuming and repetitive (Şahin, 2001). In order to keep the panelists in the process, they were constantly informed. Care was taken to provide detailed and informative answers to all questions the panelists were curious about.

Research Ethics

Ethics in research requires significant responsibilities for researchers and participants (the research community). This necessity requires adopting and implementing several ethical principles that researchers should pay attention to and comply with from the planning stage of the research to its finalization and publication. In this direction, firstly, an application was made for ethics committee permission that the research was conducted in line with ethical principles that would not harm human dignity and integrity. As a result of the application and examination, ethics committee permission was obtained from the Ethics Commission of the relevant university.

Secondly, an invitation letter invited potential participants to participate in the research. Then, the researchers were informed about the subject, purpose, process, and responsibilities of the research from time to time. Thus, the participants were allowed to participate in the process with their consent, which was in line with the information provided about the nature and process of the research. In the invitation letter, it was stated that the researchers could refuse the study, leave the research at any time, and that all information of the participants would be safely stored and anonymized (Stringer, 2007). The participants were also assured that their personal information and data would not be shared with third parties. Since the research data were collected online, a consent form was included in the online forms. Panelists volunteered by accepting this form.

Although this research does not investigate sensitive issues and the participants were anonymized, precautions were taken to prevent negative consequences for the participants. In this context, no questions were asked regarding the identity information of the participants. Thus, it was tried to prevent the participants from being identified with their data. Communicating with the panelists through their personal and institutional e-mails, rather than through mass e-mails, was tried to prevent the panelists from knowing each other and influencing their opinions and thoughts that may arise from hierarchical or social relations. Since the digital forms/surveys contained the e-mail or IP addresses of the participants, all data obtained from the participants were protected through a limited access and password-protected system.

Findings

In the 1st Delphi round, research data were collected using a single open-ended question. The collected data were analyzed using a descriptive analysis method. The draft of the DCC dimensions determined in the first round was presented to the panelists for their evaluation in the approval round and then in the second Delphi round. As a result of the consensus, the dimensions reflecting DCC were determined.

Findings on the Dimensions of Democratic Citizenship Competencies in the First Delphi Round and the Approval Round

In order to determine the dimensions of the Democratic Citizenship Competencies, Delphi rounds I, II, and III were conducted. In the I. Delphi round, the dimensions of the competencies; in the approval round, the appropriateness of the determined dimensions; and in the II. Delphi round, the consensus of the panelists on these dimensions and content expressions were tried to be determined. Tables 2, 3, 4, and 5 show the classification of the dimensions of the DCC obtained at the end of the 1st Delphi round, as well as the approval round and the consensus of the panelists after the approval round.

Table 2. Findings Regarding the Cognitive Dimension of Democratic Citizenship Competencies in the 1st Delphi Round and the Approval Round

Icons	Number of items	Delphi Round I		Approval Round	Number of items
		COGNITIVE DIMENSION			
		Knowledge and understanding			
A	**10**	Citizenship, knowledge, and understanding of the state and society	**A.1**	Citizenship, knowledge, and understanding of the state and society	**6**
A	**12**	Knowledge and understanding of democracy and democratic rights	**A.2**	Knowledge and understanding of democracy and democratic rights	**11**
A	**5**	Knowledge and understanding of cultural diversity and identity	**A.3**	Knowledge and understanding of cultural diversity and identity	**5**
B	**18**	Knowledge and understanding of politics, groups, institutions, and civil society	**A.4**	Knowledge and understanding of groups, institutions, and social organizations	**5**
			A.5	Knowledge and understanding of politics and the public sphere	**8**
B	**15**	Knowledge and understanding of law, laws, rules, rule of law, human rights and freedoms	**A.6**	Knowledge and understanding of law, the rule of law, and social norms	**8**
			A.7	Knowledge and understanding of human rights and freedoms	**8**
D	**12**	Knowledge and understanding of oneself, history, and the world	**A.8**	Knowledge and understanding of oneself and the world	**9**
D	**5**	Knowledge and understanding of social relations and cultural life	**A.9**	Knowledge and understanding of socio-cultural life and relationships	**4**
D	**12**	Knowledge and understanding of economics, sustainability, globalization, and the environment	**A.10**	Knowledge and understanding of globalization, environment, economy, and sustainability	**7**
	89				**71**

A: Remaining the same **B:** Dividing **D:** Expressively changing matter

In the 1st Delphi round, the data obtained from 61 panelists with a single open-ended question were analyzed. The themes, categories and the number of items expressing them presented in Table 2 were determined. The analyses at the end of the 1st Delphi round were expressed in four dimensions: *a) cognitive dimension, b) affective dimension, c) skills dimension, and d) holistic competencies cluster*. As a result of the 1st Delphi round, eight categories forming the *"knowledge and understanding"* theme were identified in the *"cognitive dimension."* However, upon the comments and suggestions of the panelists in the approval round, the category *"Knowledge and understanding of politics, groups, institutions, and civil society"* was rearranged into two categories: *"knowledge and understanding of groups, institutions, and social organizations"* and *"knowledge and understanding of politics and the public sphere."*

Similarly, the category *"knowledge and understanding of the law, laws, rules, the rule of law, human rights and freedoms"* was divided into two categories: *"knowledge and understanding of the law, the rule of law and social rules"* and *"knowledge and understanding of human rights and freedoms."* Thus, the number of categories was changed from 8 to 10 in the approval round. However, while categories A.1, A.2, and A.3 remained the same, minor wording changes were made in categories A.8, A.9, and A.10. As a result of the 1st Delphi round, the cognitive dimension consisted of 1 theme, eight categories, and 89 items; in the approval round, it was updated as one theme, ten categories, and 71 items.

Table 3. Findings Regarding the Affective Dimension from the 1st Delphi Round and the Confirmation Round

Icons	Number of items	B- AFFECTIVE DIMENSION Delphi Round I		Approval Round	Number of items
		Values			
D	**16**	Valuing oneself, people, human rights and freedoms	B.1	Valuing human dignity, rights, and equality	**11**
D	**11**	Valuing identity, pluralism, multiculturalism, and differences	B.2	Valuing mutual trust, understanding, and acceptance	**9**
A	**7**	Valuing compromise, dialogue, solidarity, and peace	B.3	Valuing compromise, dialogue, solidarity, and peace	**5**
D	**13**	Valuing democracy, law, and the rule of law	B.4	Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, and the rule of law	**12**
A	**11**	Valuing science and scientific thought	B.5	Valuing science and scientific thought	**8**
D	**7**	To value history, cultural heritage, aesthetics, natural environment, and sustainability	B.6	Valuing cultural heritage, the natural environment, and their protection	**6**
		Attitudes			
D	**9**	Self-confidence and personal autonomy: Feeling confident in participating in public life and being autonomous in some situations	B.7	Self-confidence, motivation, and autonomy	**7**
D	**6**	Interest and sensitivity: Being interested and sensitive to current issues	B.8	Interest and sensitivity	**5**
D	**16**	Willingness and voluntariness: Willingness and voluntariness strengthen democratic society, provide expected benefits, and develop social cohesion.	B.9	Willingness and volunteering	**12**
D	**7**	Responsibility: Being willing to take responsibility for one's own decisions and actions in individual and social relationships.	B.10	Social and moral responsibility	**6**
D	**6**	Being open to individual, cultural, and intellectual differences, beliefs, and compromises.	B.11	Being open (flexibility and versatility)	**9**
D	**8**	Social awareness: Developing awareness of local, regional and global issues	B.12	Awareness and inclusiveness	**7**
		Dispositions			
A	**5**	Being interested in public policy and inclined to exert influence in public life	B.13	Being interested in public policy and inclined to exert influence in public life	**4**
A	**4**	Tendency to produce solutions to social and global issues	B.14	Tendency to produce solutions to social and global issues	**4**
	126		**14**		**105**

At the end of the 1st Delphi round, the themes of *"values," "attitudes,"* and *"dispositions"* were identified in the affective dimension. Values theme consists of 6 categories, attitudes theme consists of 6 categories, and dispositions theme consists of 2 categories. While categories B.3, B.5, B.13, and B.14 from the affective domain competencies remained the same, minor wording changes were made in categories B.1, B.2, B.4, B.6, B.7, B.8, B.9, B.10, B.11 and B.12. While there were 126 items in total in the affective competencies cluster in the approval round, this number of items was changed to 105 in the approval round. The number of themes and categories remained the same.

Table 4. Findings of the 1st Delphi Round and Approval Round Regarding the Skill Dimension

Icons	Number of items	C- SKILL DIMENSION			Number of items
		Delphi Round I		Approval Round	
		Cognitive Skills			
D	**10**	Ability to act freely and independently (independent thinking, researching, learning and democratic decision making)	**C.1**	Independent thinking, learning, research and democratic decision making	**7**
D	**14**	Analytical thinking, questioning and explanation	**C.2**	Analytical thinking, questioning, and explanation skills	**8**
D	**14**	Reflective and critical thinking skills	**C.3**	Reflection	**8**
A		Critical thinking, questioning, and understanding	**C.4**	Critical thinking, questioning, and understanding	**11**
D	**11**	Active participation and democratic responsibility skills	**C.5**	Active participation and decision-making	**7**
D		**Social Skills**		**Social and Affective Skills**	
B	**10**	Language, communication, interaction, and collaboration skills	**C.6**	Language and discourse	**4**
			C.7	Nonviolent communication, positive interaction, and cooperation	**5**
D	**7**	Democratic listening and comprehension skills	**C.8**	Active listening and understanding	**5**
A	**8**	Democratic debate	**C.9**	Democratic debate	**7**
D		Self-management	**C.10**	Self-management and self-regulation	**4**
D	**8**	Empathic thinking skills	**C.11**	Developing connection and empathy	**8**
			C.12	Negotiating and resolving disputes/disagreements	**8**
	82				**82**

At the end of the 1st Delphi round, two themes were identified in the *"skills"* dimension: *"cognitive skills"* and *"social skills"*. In the confirmation round, while the *"cognitive skills"* theme remained the same, the "social skills*" theme was renamed as "*social and affective skills". There were 5 categories each in the *"cognitive skills"* and *"social skills"* themes. In the confirmation round, the number of categories in the cognitive skills theme remained the same, while the number of categories in the social and affective skills theme increased from 5 to 7. As a result of the 1st Delphi round analysis, *"language, communication, interaction, and cooperation skills"* in the theme of *"social skills"* were expressed in two different categories: *"language and discourse"* and *"nonviolent communication, positive interaction and cooperation"* in the approval round. While the categories C.4, *"critical thinking, questioning and understanding,"* and C.9, *"democratic discussion,"* in the skills category remained the same, minor wording changes were made in categories C.1, C.2, C.3, C.5, C8, C.10 and C.11. Thus, the *"skills dimension"* consisted of 2 themes, 12 categories, and 82 items.

Table 5. Findings of the I. Delphi Round and Confirmation Round Regarding the Integrative Competencies Dimension

Icons	Number of items	D- INTEGRATIVE COMPETENCIES		Number of items
		Delphi round I	Approval round	
	8	Social unity and social integrity	**D.1**	
Y	**9**	Reflection	**D.2**	
Y	**8**	Resolving disputes and negotiating	**D.3**	
	25		**3**	

Y: Substitution

Some items under the *"social unity and social integrity"* category in the *"holistic competencies"* dimension, which was identified as a fourth dimension due to the 1st Delphi Round, were merged with other related items due to panelist comments in the approval round. The "*reflection*" and *"resolving and negotiating conflicts"* categories were changed to include social and affective skills. *"Holistic competencies"* were expressed in other dimensions in line with the opinions and suggestions of the panelists. Thus, the number of items in the Skills dimension, which was 107, including holistic competencies, was changed to 82 after the approval round.

Findings on the Dimensions of Democratic Citizenship Competencies in the Approval Round and the Second Delphi Round

Delphi round II was the last round in which the panelists reached a consensus. The dimensions agreed upon as a result of this round were accepted as the dimensions reflecting the DCC. The number of items obtained as a result of this round and the consensus of the panelists are given in Tables 6, 7, and 8. (Only themes and categories are given so as not to increase the volume of the article. See Akarsu, 2022 for all items).

Table 6. Number of Items and Levels of Consensus of Panelists on Cognitive Dimension in Approval Round and 2nd Delphi Round

A. COGNITIVE DIMENSION		**Number of approval round items**	**Number of items II. Delphi round**	**Approval round consensus rate**	**Consensus rate in the II. Delphi round**
No	**Knowledge and understanding**			**%**	**%**
A.1	Citizenship, knowledge, and understanding of the state and society	7	6	75	96,78
A.2	Knowledge and understanding of democracy and democratic rights	10	10	92,5	96,58
A.3	Knowledge and understanding of cultural diversity and identity	5	5	95	96,63
A.4	Knowledge and understanding of groups, institutions, and social organizations	4	4	82,5	94,86
A.5	Knowledge and understanding of politics and the public sphere	9	9	75	95,95
A.6	Knowledge and understanding of law, the rule of law, and social norms	8	7	87,5	98,30
A.7	Knowledge and understanding of human rights and freedoms	8	7	100	97,44
A.8	Knowledge and understanding of oneself and the world	9	9	82,5	94,20
A.9	Knowledge and understanding of socio-cultural life and relationships	3	3	92,5	96,26
A.10	Knowledge and understanding of globalization, environment, economy, and sustainability	8	8	82,5	94,30
Consensus rate		**71**	**68**	**86,50**	**96,13**
Total Number of Items		**71**	**68**		

As seen in Table 6, the categories constituting the cognitive dimension were expressed under the meta-theme of *"knowledge and understanding"*. Under this theme, 10 different categories and 71 items constituting the cognitive dimension were identified. In the second Delphi round, a total of 3 items in categories A-1, A-3, and A-3 were removed from the framework because they repeated each other. On the cognitive dimension, 86.50% consensus was reached in the approval round and 96.13% in the second Delphi round. The theme of *"knowledge and understanding*" was agreed upon by the panelists with a significant consensus (96.13%): *Knowledge and understanding of citizenship, state, and society; knowledge and understanding of democracy and democratic rights; knowledge and understanding of cultural diversity and identity; knowledge and understanding of groups, institutions, and social organizations; knowledge and understanding of politics and the public sphere; knowledge and understanding of the law, the rule of law and social rules; knowledge and understanding of human rights and freedoms; knowledge and understanding of self and the world; knowledge and understanding of social-cultural life and relationships; knowledge and understanding of globalization, environment, economy and sustainability*.

The categories in the cognitive dimension emphasize the knowledge that students participating in life as democratic citizens should know and the understanding they should develop through this knowledge. The cognitive dimension is defined as individuals' knowledge and understanding of democracy, citizenship, human rights, law, politics, cultural diversity, differences, and globalization, as well as how they combine, develop, and use this knowledge.

Table 7. Number of Items and Levels of Consensus of Panelists on Affective Dimension in Approval Round and 2nd Delphi Round

B. AFFECTIVE DIMENSION		**Number of approval round items**	**Number of items II. Delphi round**	**Approval round consensus rate**	**Consensus rate in the II. Delphi round**
No	**Values**			**%**	**%**
B.1	Valuing human dignity, rights, and equality	11	11	97,5	100
B.2	Valuing mutual trust, understanding, and acceptance	9	9	92,5	100
B.3	Valuing compromise, dialogue, solidarity, and peace	5	5	87,5	100
B.4	Valuing democracy, justice, fairness, and the rule of law	12	12	97,5	100
B.5	Valuing science and scientific thought	8	8	80	75
B.6	Valuing cultural heritage, the natural environment, and their protection	6	6	87,5	87,5
Consensus Rate		**51**	**51**		**93,75**
No	**Tutumlar**				
B.7	Self-confidence, motivation, and autonomy	7	7	92,5	100
B.8	Interest and sensitivity	5	5	87,5	100
B.9	Willingness and volunteering	13	12	87,5	87,5
B.10	Social and moral responsibility	5	4	100	100
B.11	Being open (flexibility and versatility)	9	9	92,5	87,5
B.12	Awareness and inclusiveness	7	7	87,5	100
Consensus Rate		**46**	**44**		**95,83**
No	**Dispositions**				
B.13	Being interested in public policy and inclined to exert influence in public life	4	4	92,5	100
B.14	Tendency to produce solutions to social and global issues	4	4	82,5	87,5
Consensus Rate		**8**	**8**	**87,50**	**93,75**
Overall agreement rate on values/attitudes/dispositions themes				**89,72**	**94,44**
Total Number of Items		**105**	**103**		

As seen in Table 7, the affective dimension was expressed under three different themes: *"values," "attitudes,"* and *"dispositions."* A total of 14 categories (6 in the theme of values, 6 in the theme of attitudes, and 2 in the theme of dispositions) and 105 items constituting these categories were identified. At the end of the second Delphi round, as a result of the opinions received, 2 items were removed because they repeated each other. In the approval round, the highest rate of consensus was 91.25% for *"attitudes,"* secondly 90.40% for "values," and finally 87.5% for "*dispositions."* In the second Delphi round, the highest level of consensus was achieved in the *"attitudes"* theme with a rate of 95.83%, while the highest level of consensus was achieved in the *"values"* and *""attitudes"* themes with a rate of 93.75%.

Table 8. Number of Items and Levels of Consensus of Panelists on Skill Dimension in Approval Round and Delphi Round II

C. SKILL DIMENSION		**Number of approval round items**	**Number of items II. Delphi round**	**Approval round consensus rate**	**Consensus rate in the II. Delphi round**
No	**Cognitive Skills**			**%**	**%**
C.1	Independent thinking, learning, research, and democratic decision-making	7	7	82,5	87,5
C.2	Analytical thinking, questioning, and explanation skills	8	8	80	87,5
C.3	Reflection	8	8	92,5	100
C-4	Critical thinking, questioning, and understanding	11	11	92,5	100
C.5	Active participation and decision-making	7	7	100	100
		41	**41**	**89,50**	**95,00**
No	**Social and Affective Skills**				
C.6	Language and discourse	4	4	82,5	75
C.7	Nonviolent communication, positive interaction, and cooperation	5	5	97,5	100
C.8	Active listening and understanding	5	5	82,5	87,5
C.9	Democratic debate	7	7	92,5	100
C.10	Self-management and self-regulation	4	4	82,5	87,5
C.11	Developing connection and empathy	8	8	92,5	100
C.12	Negotiating and resolving disputes/disagreements	8	8	87,5	100
Consensus rate		**41**	**41**	**88,20**	**92,85**
Consensus rate on skill dimension				**88,85**	**93,90**
General consensus rate on A, B, and C dimensions				**88,35**	**94,82**
Total number of items		**82**	**82**		

Although it may seem difficult and also problematic to express the skills under separate dimensions, they were expressed under two different super-themes, namely *"cognitive skills"* and "*social and affective skills"*. Thus, a total of 12 categories, 5 under the theme of "cognitive skills" and seven under the theme of "social and affective skills", and a total of 82 items constituting these categories were identified. As a result of the opinions received at the end of the second Delphi round, the number and content of the item remained the same.

As seen in Table 8, 89.50% of the cognitive skills theme was approved in the approval round and 95.00% in the second Delphi round; 88.20% of the social and affective skills theme was approved in the approval round and 92.85% in the second Delphi round. In the skills dimension, 88.85% consensus was reached in the approval round and 93.90% in the second Delphi round.

Conclusion Discussion and Recommendations

As a result of the research, three dimensions, *"cognitive," "affective "* and *"skill"* were determined to constitute DCC. In the approval round, the highest level of agreement was reached on the *"skill dimension"* at 88.85%, the "*affective dimension"* at 87.50%, and the *"cognitive dimension"* at 86.50%. In the approval round, an average of 88.35% consensus was reached on these three dimensions. In the II. Delphi round, the highest levels of agreement were reached on the "*emotionl dimension"* at 94.4%, *"skill dimension"* at 93.75%, and *"cognitive dimension"* at 96.13%. As a result of the II. Delphi round, a general average of 94.82% consensus was reached on these three dimensions. Thus, a consensus was reached that the themes, categories, and items under these three dimensions constitute the dimensions of DCC.

The cognitive dimension includes the knowledge and understanding dimension of democratic citizenship; the affective dimension includes values, attitudes, and dispositions; and the skills dimension includes cognitive, affective, and social skills. There is a significant body of international literature supporting the *"cognitive", " affective,"* and *"skills dimension"* of citizenship education (Audiger, 2000; Biesta, 2007; Birzea, 2000; Dumitru, 2017; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Hoskins, 2013; Menthe, 2012; Parker & Jarolimek, 1984, Print, 2013; Veugelers, 2007; Veldhuis, 1997). Although these three dimensions reflecting DCC as a result of the Delphi rounds are structurally similar to some classifications in the literature (Biesta, 2007; Birzea, 2000; Council of Europe, 2018; Dumitru, 2017; Hoskins & Deakin Crick, 2010; McCowan, 2009; Menthe, 2012; Parker & Jarolimek, 1984; Veldhuis, 1997; Veugelers, 2007), they offer a framework specific to Turkey in terms of their content.

The findings of this study overlap with various approaches in the DCE literature. While Veldhuis (1997) emphasized the four dimensions of democratic citizenship education, Print (2013) defined democratic citizenship competencies through knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes using the Delphi technique. The Council of Europe's (2018) Reference Framework for Competencies for Democratic Culture provides a comprehensive model that includes the categories of values, attitudes, skills, and critical understanding of DCE. The findings of this study largely overlap with the curriculum framework, mainly Doğanay's (2012) focus on *'knowledge,' 'skills',* and *'affective domains,'* but take more account of the micro-level sensitivities specific to the Turkish context. Despite the different classifications, the common goal of these studies is to prepare students for civic and public life as responsible and moral individuals who can think critically. In this context, the current research reflects an understanding of DCE that addresses universal and local needs.

Although the dimensions put forward in this study produce results that generally support the findings of some studies (Audiger, 2000; Council of Europe, 2018; Doğanay, 2012; Veugelers, 2007), they differ from other studies in terms of the way they address competence. For example, the Council of Europe (2018) considers values, attitudes, skills, knowledge, and critical understanding of core competencies for DCE at the macro level. In contrast to these competencies proposed by the Council of Europe, in this study, with a more micro approach, these are seen as dimensions that constitute competence rather than competence. In this research, 'competence' is considered a more inclusive concept formed as a result of the combination and intersection of components such as knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and dispositions, as stated by Print (2013). For this reason, 'Democratic Citizenship Competencies,' which is a continuation of this research, is considered a secondary research topic by the authors.

Özpolat (2009) states that a citizenship education not based on democratic values, attitudes, and tendencies such as justice, democracy, the rule of law, respect, openness, tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, listening, etc., will prioritize ideological elements rather than humanitarian concerns. He states that citizenship education based on ideological themes will render the individual passive towards the state, various organized structures, and certain political and philosophical theses. He emphasizes that this situation will encourage marginalization in relations and distract the individual from being rational. Thus, he underlines that significant social integration and coexistence risks will become more difficult (p.163). Giroux and McLaren (1989) emphasize the politics of difference in this context,

integrating macro and micro analyses by focusing on the differences and cultural forms that give meaning and significance to everyday life. *Affe* categories such as "valuing reconciliation, dialogue, solidarity, and peace," "valuing cultural heritage, natural environment, and their protection," "social and moral responsibility," "openness (being flexible and versatile)," "being inclined to produce solutions to social and global issues," "openness (being flexible and versatile)," which emerged in this research, are seen as important components in overcoming the concerns Özpolat underlines in developing a sense of coexistence and common community; It also reflects the combination of macro and micro components as stated by Giroux and McLaren (1989).

Audiger (2000) sees the cognitive dimension as the foundation of democratic behavior and argues that political literacy supports individuals in becoming informed citizens, explaining situations, and understanding political processes (p. 21). Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, and Agrusti (2017) argue that one of the most important goals of DCE is developing civic knowledge. Duerr, Spajic-Vrakas, and Martins (2000) argue that factual and conceptual knowledge significantly impact the development of attitudes, skills, and values. Social workers and citizenship educators state that knowledge about society and politics is valuable in itself and is a prerequisite for the acquisition and development of democratic values, attitudes, and dispositions, as well as for effective participation in democratic processes (Audiger, 2000; Dumitru, 2017; Niemi & Junn, 1998; Parker & Jarolimek, 1997; Veldhuis, 1997). The results of these studies show that the knowledge dimension is important for other dimensions and components. In this study, the cognitive dimension is the most emphasized and essential because it is denser than the other dimensions regarding the number of categories and the ratios in the number of items.

On the other hand, values, attitudes, and dispositions, which express affective dimensions, are seen as essential components of democratic decision-making and intrinsic motivations that motivate students' willing participation in democratic processes, as stated by Print (2013, p. 159). Similarly, Noddings (2002) attributes importance to values by stating that the willingness to use knowledge and skills is value-oriented. Although promoting inclusive and binding democratic values promotes democratic acculturation and democratic practices (Menthe, 2012), what is important is that knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes are organized together to create a culture of democracy. For example, knowledge about politics promotes participatory practices, while participatory practices as a means of emancipatory values bring about democratic values. Democratic values and attitudes, on the other hand, contribute to developing essential skills such as respecting others in the canteen and waiting for one's turn without getting in front of others. Therefore, knowledge, skills, and attitudes can only make people more democratic if they are conducive to a culture of democracy. Otherwise, knowledge, skills, attitudes, and dispositions themselves do not make people better or more democratic.

Carretero et al., (2016) discuss citizenship skills under three headings: cognitive, participation, social, and affective skills. Cognitive skills involve the peaceful negotiation and resolution of public issues from new perspectives. The skills of analyzing and synthesizing information are actively used. Participation skills include the ability to work, collaborate, reach a consensus, problem solve, and negotiate on a public issue with other stakeholders of the society; skills such as voting, peaceful protests, volunteering, fundraising, and organizing petitions. On the other hand, social-affective skills refer to individuals' ability to establish and develop healthy relationships with their social environment by avoiding harassment that threatens society and themselves. Although skills have been categorized as different from each other by the aforementioned studies, they are too complex to be separated from each other with precise lines. For example, while the *Partnership for 21st Century Learning* has identified 'critical thinking and problem-solving' as one of the basic skills, Branson and Quigley (1998) consider this as 'intellectual skills.' Therefore, the skills included in this classification include the skills that students are expected to have in order to evaluate the problems they encounter in both civil and public spheres in a multi-dimensional way (communication, cooperation, participation, critical thinking, problem-solving, innovation, creativity, developing different perspectives, etc.). Although the skills included in this study are all these, they are expressed more democratically. For example, importance

is given to 'democratic discussion skills' rather than 'discussion skills' itself. The main reason is that the contradictions and violence inherent in a discussion can only be possible with a discussion format open to different ideas, different understandings and cultures, respectful, sensitive, and tolerant, not with an ordinary discussion. For this reason, the dimensions presented in this study express the conformity with the nature of democracy and democratic citizenship education rather than general goals.

The research results show that the social, cultural, economic, and political structure of a society affects democratic beliefs and attitudes (Doğanay, 2008; Güven, 2005; Witteborood n.d., cited in Veldhuis, 1997) These results also reveal that values, attitudes, and tendencies affect knowledge and skills, as well as being affected by them. For this reason, in a society where human dignity, rights, and equality are valued, it is more likely that individuals will develop attitudes and participatory skills such as self-confidence, motivation, and autonomy.

Since it is impossible to separate knowledge from skills, values, attitudes, and tendencies during the learning process, all dimensions should be related and organized in a way that will support each other and provide active participation in a cyclical order. For example, the peaceful resolution of conflicts requires the functional activation of all dimensions together. In order to resolve a conflict peacefully, an individual must first have knowledge about democratic principles (knowledge) and adopt peaceful solutions (value), then control himself and his anger, take an objective stance (attitude), and be willing to resolve the conflict (tendency) and finally be able to use communication, dialogue and compromise skills (skill) that can resolve the conflict. Therefore, this research emphasizes that citizenship education should be addressed with a holistic and comprehensive understanding that does not exclude any dimension, accepting that citizenship education is a broad field of study that includes knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and tendencies.

The dimensions reflecting the DCC developed in line with the cumulatively obtained data and the themes, categories, and items that constitute these dimensions indicate the need for further research. Educators can benefit from the findings of this research when planning research to develop ideas and practices on how to prepare future citizens for a constantly changing, culturally complex, globally connected democratic society. On the other hand, curriculum developers, administrators, and teachers can use these dimensions as an analytical tool in all education processes. Teachers, in particular, can benefit from these dimensions and their constituent components to reflect and develop their in and out-of-class practices. While the dimensions reflecting the DCC provide information on the knowledge, skills, values, attitudes, and tendencies necessary to develop and sustain a democratic society, they do not provide practices and applications for acquiring these. Studies can be conducted at local and national levels on how and through what kind of activities the dimensions determined as a result of this research can be acquired in civil and public life.

In this study, the school was considered an essential component to determine the dimensions reflecting DCC; however, although these dimensions determined within the scope of DCC are more related to the school curriculum, they also indicate that family, society, and other external factors are practical and that they should be in integrity that affects and supports each other. For this reason, in future studies, these dimensions can be expanded and enriched by taking family, environment, and other components as a basis.

References

Akarsu, A. H. (2022). *Ortaokul öğrencilerine yönelik demokratik vatandaşlık yeterliklerinin geliştirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

Akyıldız, S. (2016). Hak ve özgürlüklere saygı değerini kazandırmada sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerince yapılan etkinlikler. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi, 24*(3), 1271-1288.

Apple, M. W. (2017). *Eğitim toplumu değiştirebilir mi?* (Ş. Çınkır, Trans.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (2016). *Demokratik okullar* (2nd ed., M. Sarı, Trans.). Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları.

Aratemur-Çimen, C., & Bayhan, S. (2018). *Değişen ders kitaplarında sekülerizm ve toplumsal cinsiyet eşitliği araştırması raporu*. Retrieved from https://drive.google.com/file/d/1snuCY-01L3KVb0janthXXDwfZ3Fs2gvk/view?fbclid=IwAR3DKyul-FcKviBSNCXMEbS8Nhsi9MLjTwMdJyQtaj3sjWZ5YZjKIMAWwPlE

Audiger, F. (1996). *Teaching about society passing on values. Elementary law in civic education. A secondary education for Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Audiger, F. (2000). *Project "education for democratic citizenship": Basic concepts and core competencies for democratic citizenship education.* Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher, 37*(3), 129-139. doi:10.3102/0013189X08317501

Banks, J. A. (2011). Educating citizens in diverse societies. *Intercultural Education, 22*(4), 243-251. doi:10.1080/14675986.2011.617417

Berkant, H. G., & Arslan, T. (2015). Sosyal bilgiler öğretim programında yer alan öğretim yöntem ve tekniklerinin uygulanmasına yönelik öğretmen görüşleri. *Electronic Turkish Studies, 10*(11), 293-312. doi:10.7827/TurkishStudies.8643

Biesta, G. J. J. (2007). Education and the democratic person: Towards a political conception of democratic education. *Teachers College Record*, *109*(3), 740-769.

Birzea, C. (2000). *Education for democratic citizenship: A lifelong learning perspective*. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Branson, M. S., & Quigley, C. N. (1998). *The role of civic education*. Center for Civic Education. Retrieved from http://www.civiced.org/papers/articles_role.html

Burns, W. D. (2002). Knowledge to make our democracy. *Liberal Education-Washington DC-, 88*(4), 20-27.

Callan, E. (1997). *Creating citizens. Political education and liberal democracy.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carretero, M., Haste, H., & Bermudez, A. (2016). Civic education. In L. Corno & E. M. Anderman (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 295-308). London: Routledge.

Castro, A. J., & Knowles, R. T. (2017). Democratic citizenship education: Research across multiple landscapes and contexts. In M. M. Manfra & C. M. Bolick (Eds.), *The wiley handbook of social studies research* (pp. 287-318). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Caymaz, B., (2008). Citizenship education in Turkey. In A.-M. Nohl, A. Akkoyunlu-Wigley, & S. Wigley (Eds.), *Education in Turkey* (pp.195-226). Münster: Waxmann Verlag.

Clayton, M. J. (1997). Delphi: A technique to harness expert opinion for critical educational decision-making tasks. *Educational Psychology, 17*(4), 373-386.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.

Council of Europe. (2010). *Council of Europe charter on education for democratic citizenship and human rights education.* Council of Europe Publishing.

Council of Europe. (2018). *Demokratik kültür yetkinlikleri referans çerçevesi* (Vol. 1). Retrieved from https://rm.coe.int/rfcdc-1-turkish/1680a1458e

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research Design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Karma yöntem araştırmalarına giriş* (M. Sözbilir, Trans.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2015). *Karma yöntem araştırmaları tasarımı ve yürütülmesi* (Y. Dede, & S. B. Demir, Ed. & Trans.). Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crick, B. (1999). The presuppositions of citizenship education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *33*(3), 337-352.

Cowan, P., & Maitles, H. (2016). *Understanding and teaching holocaust education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Çayır, K. (2004). Consciousness of human rights and democracy in textbooks. D. T. Ceylan & G. Irzık (Eds.), *Human rights issues in textbooks: The Turkish case* (pp. 91-107). İstanbul: The History Foundation of Turkey.

Çayır, K. (2010). Yeni bir "biz" anlayışı geliştirme yolunda eğitim, ders kitapları ve okullar. In K. Çayır (Ed.), *Ders kitapları ve okullar, eğitim, çatışma ve toplumsal barış: Türkiye'den ve dünyadan örnekler* (pp. 25-36). İstanbul: Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

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

Dalkey, N. C. (1969). An experimental study of group opinion: the Delphi method. *Futures*, *1*(5), 408-426.

Dalkey, N. C. (2002). Toward a theory of group estimation. In H. A Linstone ve M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications* (pp. 231-256). London: Addison-Wesley

Dalkey, N. C., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, *9*(3), 458-467. doi:10.1287/mnsc.9.3.458

Dewey. J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey. J. (2020). *Demokrasi ve eğitim* (M. Karaman, Çev.). Ankara: Gece Kitaplığı.

Doğanay, A. (2008). Çağdaş sosyal bilgiler anlayışı ışığında yeni sosyal bilgiler programının değerlendirilmesi. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *17*(2), 77-96. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip4001_2

Doğanay, A. (2012). A curriculum framework for active democratic citizenship education. In M. Print & D. Lange (Eds.), *Schools, curriculum and civic education for building democratic citizens* (pp. 19-39). Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Duerr, K., Spajic-Vrka, V., & Martins, I. F. (2000). *Strategies for learning democratic citizenship.* Council of Europe.

Duman, P. (2023). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin derslerinde kullandıkları yöntem ve tekniklere ilişkin görüşleri. *International Journal of Progressive Studies in Education (IJOPSE), 1*(1), 31-50.

Dumitru, V. (2017). Education for democratic citizenship. *Cogito Multidisciplinary Research Journal, 9*(2), 14-24.

Elkatmış, M. (2013). 1998 vatandaşlık ve insan hakları eğitimi programı ile 2010 vatandaşlık ve demokrasi eğitimi programlarının karşılaştırılması. *Journal of Kirsehir Education Faculty, 14*(3), 59-74.

Engle, S. H., & Ochoa, A. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship: Decision making in the social studies*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ersoy, A. F. (2016). Vatandaşlık ve demokrasi eğitimi dersine ilişkin sosyal bilgiler öğretmenleri ve öğrencilerinin algısı. *İnönü Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 17*(3), 67-83. doi:10.17679/iuefd.17345163

Faiz, M., & Karasu Avcı, E. (2018). 4. ve 5. sınıf sosyal bilgiler dersleri "etkin vatandaşlık" öğrenme alanındaki yer alan ve boyutların değerlendirilmesi. *Uluslararası Sosyal Bilgilerde Yeni Yaklaşımlar Dergisi (IJONASS), 2*(1), 1-21.

Gemalmaz, M. S. (2004). *İnsan hakları belgeleri.* İstanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Yayınevi.

Giroux, H. A. (1980). Critical theory and rationality in citizenship education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 10*(4), 329-366. doi:10.2307/1179823

Giroux, H. A. (1998). Public pedagogy and rodent politics: Cultural studies and the challenge of Disney. *Arizona Journal of Hispanic Cultural Studies*, *2*(1), 253-266.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. L., (1989). Introduction: Schooling, cultural politics, and the struggle for democracy. In H. A. Giroux & P. L. McLaren (Eds.), *Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle* (pp. xi-xxxv). Albany: State University of Newyork Press.

Gök, F. (2004). Citizenship and human rights education textbooks. In D. Tarba Ceylan & G. Irzık (Eds.), *Human rights issues in textbooks: The Turkish case* (pp. 108-112). İstanbul: Türkiye Tarih Vakfı Yayınları.

Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. John Wiley & Sons.

Grisham, T. (2008). The Delphi technique: A method for testing complex and multifaceted topics. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business, 2*(1), 112-130. doi:10.1108/17538370910930545

Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gürses, F. (2010). *Türkiye'de ders kitaplarında yurttaşlık: Cumhuriyet'in kuruluş yıllarından bugüne kavramsal dönüşüm* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Güven, İ. (2005). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin mesleki gelişim ve yeterlikleri. *Bilim ve Aklın Aydınlığında Eğitim Dergisi*, *5*(60), 31-39.

Haltinner, U. R. (2008). *Achieving consensus on secondary marketing education curriculum and instruction-a Delphi study* (Doctoral dissertation). The Graduate School of The University of Minnesota, Minnesota.

Harris, C. (2005). *The report of the Democracy Commission: Engaging citizens: the case for democratic renewal in Ireland*. Dublin: TASC at New Island.

Hess, D. E., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education.* London: Routledge.

Hoskins, B. (2013). What does democracy need from its citizens?: Identifying the qualities needed for active citizenship and making the values explicit. In M. Print & D. Lange (Eds.), *Civic education and competences for engaging citizens in democracies* (pp. 23-35). Rotterdam: Sense.

Hoskins, B., & Crick, R. D. (2010). Competences for learning to learn and active citizenship: Different currencies or two sides of the same coin?. *European Journal of Education, 45*(1), 121-137.

Hsu, C. C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 12*(10), 1-8.

Izgar, G. (2013). *İlköğretim okulu 8. sınıf öğrencilerine uygulanan değerler eğitimi programının demokratik tutum ve davranışlarına etkisi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Konya Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi, Konya.

İnal, K. (2019). *Türkiye'de eğitim ve politika.* Ankara: Töz Yayınları.

İnce, B. (2012). Citizenship education in Turkey: Inclusive or exclusive. *Oxford Review of Education, 38*(2), 115-131. doi:10.1080/03054985.2011.651314

İpek, İ. (2011). *İlköğretim 6. ve 7. sınıf sosyal bilgiler ders kitaplarında vatandaşlık eğitiminin sosyal bilgiler öğretim programındaki hedeflere uygunluğu yönünden değerlendirilmesi* (Unpublished master's thesis). Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2014). *Eğitim araştırmaları: Eğitimde nicel, nitel ve karma yaklaşımlar* (S. B. Demir, Ed. & Trans.). Ankara: Eğiten.

Johnson, B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher, 33*(7), 14-26.

Johnson, L., & Morris, P. (2010). Towards a framework for critical citizenship education. *The Curriculum Journal, 21*(1), 77-96. doi:10.1080/09585170903560444

Kancı, T. (2008). *Imagining the Turkish men and women: Nationalism, modernism and militarism in primary school textbooks, 1928-2000* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Sabancı University, İstanbul.

Kaya, A. (2003). Ulusal yurttaşlıktan çoğul yurttaşlığa? Yurttaşlık kuramlarına eleştirel bir yaklaşım. In A. Kaya & G. G. Özdoğan (Eds.), *Uluslararası ilişkilerde sınır tanımayan sorunlar: Göç, yurttaşlık, insan hakları, toplumsal cinsiyet, küresel adalet ve güvenlik* (pp. 149-190). İstanbul: Bağlam Yayıncılık.

Kerr, D. (2003). Citizenship: Local, national, and international. In L. Gearon (Ed.), *Learning to teach citizenship in the secondary school* (pp. 7-8). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Kuş, Z., & Yakar, H. (2021). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmenlerinin demokrasiye yönelik inançları ve sınıf içi uygulamaları. *Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 22(1*), 332- 371.

Kymlicka, W. (2008). Education for citizenship. In J. Arthur & I. Davies (Eds.), *Citizenship education* (pp. 128-156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (2012). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory (C. Cemgil, Trans.). In A. Kadıoğlu (Ed.), *Vatandaşlığın dönüşümü: Üyelikten haklara* (pp. 185-217). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Linstone, H., A. (1975). Eight basic pitfalls: A checklist. In H. A. Linstone & M. Turoff (Eds.), *The Delphi method techniques and applications* (pp. 559-571). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

McCowan, T. (2009). *Rethinking citizenship education: A curriculum for participatory democracy*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

McLaren, P. (2011) *Okullarda yaşam: Eleştirel pedagojiye giriş* (M. Y. Eryaman, & H. Arslan, Ed. & Trans.). Ankara.: Anı Yayıncılık.

Menthe, J. (2012). Education for democratic citizenship. Values vs process. In M. Print & D. Lange (Eds.), *Schools, curriculum and civic education for building democratic citizens* (pp. 73-78). Leiden: Sense Publishers (Brill).

Merriam, S. B. (2013). Nitel araştırmalarda geçerlik, güvenirlik ve etik (E. Dinç, Trans.). In S. Turan (Ed.), *Nitel araştırma desen ve uygulama için bir rehber* (pp. 199-228). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ministry of National Education. (2005). *Sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretim programı (ilkokul ve ortaokul 4, 5, 6 ve 7. sınıflar).* Ankara: Devlet Kitapları Müdürlüğü Basımevi.

Ministry of National Education. (2012). İlköğretim kurumları (ilkokul ve ortaokul) haftalık ders çizelgesi. *Millî Eğitim Bakanlığı Tebliğler Dergisi, 75(*2658), 314-316.

Ministry of National Education. (2018). *Sosyal bilgiler dersi öğretim programı (ilkokul ve ortaokul 4, 5, 6 ve 7. sınıflar).* Ankara: MEB Devlet Kitapları.

Ministry of National Education. (2019). *Temel eğitimde demokrasi kültürünün güçlendirilmesi projesi.* Retrieved from https://tegm.meb.gov.tr/www/temel-egitimde-demokrasi-kulturunun-guclendirilmesi-projesi/icerik/536

Nagy, S., & Biber, H. (2010). *Mixed methods research*. New York-London: The Guilford Press.

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.

Neuman, W. L. (2012). *Toplumsal araştırma yöntemleri: Nicel ve nitel yaklaşımlar* (Vol. I-II). İstanbul: Yayın Odası.

Niemi, R., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Oğuz, A. K. (2007). *Fedakâr eş fedakâr yurttaş: Yurttaşlık bilgisi ve yurttaş eğitimi, 1970-1990* (1st ed.). İstanbul: Kitap Yayınevi.

O'Shea, K. (2001-2004). *Demokratik vatandaşlık eğitimi. Ortak bir anlayışın geliştirilmesi.* Council of Europe.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2006). Education for democratic citizenship: A review of research, policy and practice 1995-2005. *Research Papers in Education, 21*(4), 433-466.

Önal, G. (2019). *Vatandaşlık ve sivil toplum.* In C. Öztürk, Z. İbrahimoğlu, & G. Yıldırım (Eds.), *Kuramsal temeller ve güncel tartışmalar ışığında 21. yüzyılda vatandaşlık ve vatandaşlık eğitimi* (1st ed., pp. 171-192). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Özpolat, A. (2009). *Demokratik vatandaşlık. Birlikte yaşama kültürü.* Ankara: Hegem Yayınları.

Parker, W. C. (1995). *Educating the democratic mind.* New York: SUNY.

Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College.

Parker, W. C. (2008). Knowing and doing in democratic citizenship education. In L. S. Levstik & C. A. Tyson (Eds.), *Handbook of research in social studies education* (pp. 65-80). London: Routledge.

Parker, W. C. (2018). Demokratik vatandaşlık eğitimi (M. Avaroğulları, Trans.). In F. Zayimoğlu Öztürk & S. B. Demir (Eds.), *İlkokul ve ortaokulda sosyal bilgiler eğitimi* (pp. 70-115). Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Parker, W. C., & Beck, T. A. (2017). *Social studies in elementary education*. Pearson.

Parker, W. C., & Jarolimek, J. (1984). *Citizenship and the critical role of social studies*. Washington, DC: NCSS Bulletin.

Parker, W. C., & Jarolimek J. (1997). *Social studies in elementary education.* Columbus: MerrilVPrentice Hall.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Print, M. (2013). Conceptualizing competences for democratic citizenship: A Delphi approach. In M. Print & D. Lange (Eds.), *Civic education and competences for engaging citizens in democracies* (pp. 149-162). Rotterdam: Sense.

Print, M. (2013). Competences for democratic citizenship in Europe. In M. Print & D. Lange (Eds.), *Civic education and competences for engaging citizens in democracies* (s. 39-48). Rotterdam: Sense.

Pykett, J. (2007). Making citizens governable? The Crick Report as governmental technology. *Journal of Education Policy, 22*(3), 301-319.

Remy, R. C. (1979). *Handbook of basic citizenship competencies*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Ross, A. (2008). Organizing a curriculum for active citizenship education. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, & C. L. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 492-505). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (1999). The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: Issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting, 15*(4), 353-375. doi:10.1016/S0169-2070(99)00018-7

Sackman, H. (1975). *Delphi assessment: Expert opinion, forecasting, and group process*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2017). *IEA international civic and citizenship education study 2016 assessment framework.* Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Skulmoski, G. J., Hartman, F. T., & Krahn, J. (2007). The Delphi method for graduate research. *Journal of Information Technology Education,* 6, 1-21.

Slaughter, D. (2017). *Stop telling members of marginalized groups to be tolerant* [Facebook Live]. Mamademics Academy.

Soder, R., Goodlad, J. I., & McMannon, T. J. (2001). *Developing democratic character in the youth*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Soysal, Y. N., & Wong, S. Y. (2007). Educating future citizens in Europe and Asia. In A. Benavot & C. Braslavsky (Eds.), *School knowledge in comparative and historical perspective* (pp. 73-88). Dordrecht: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-5736-6_5

Sprenkle, D. H., & Piercy, F. P. (2005). *Research methods in family therapy* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.

Stringer, C. (2007). Empirical performance management research: Observations from AOS and MAR. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management, 4*(2), 92-114.

Şahin, A. E. (2001). Eğitim araştırmalarında delphi tekniği ve kullanımı. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 20, 215-220.

Şahin, A. E. (2010). Professional status of elementary teaching in Turkey: A Delphi study. *Teachers And Teaching: Theory And Practice*, *16*(4), 437-459.

Şen, A. (2019a). Militarisation of citizenship education curriculum in Turkey. *Journal of Peace Education, 1*(26). doi:10.1080/17400201.2018.1481019

Şen, A. (2019b). Vatandaşlık eğitiminde değişiklik ve süreklilikler: 2018 sosyal bilgiler öğretim programı nasıl bir vatandaşlık eğitimi öngörüyor?. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi, 7(1*), 1-28.

Şen, A., & Starkey, H. (2017). The rise and fall of citizenship and human rights education in Turkey. *Journal of Social Science Education, 16*(4), 84-96. doi:10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v16-i4-1689

Şimşek, U., Doymuş, K., Şimşek, Ü., & Özdemir, Y. (2006). Lise düzeyinde eğitim gören öğrencilerin demokratik tutumlarına işbirlikçi öğrenme yönteminin etkisinin incelenmesi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, *7*(1), 165-172.

Üstel, F. (2019). *"Makbul vatandaş"ın peşinde: II. Meşrutiyet'ten bugüne Türkiye'de vatandaşlık eğitimi* (8th ed.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Veldhuis, R. (1997). *Education for democratic citizenship: Dimensions of citizenship, core competencies, variables, and international activities.* Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Veugelers, W. (2007). Creating critical-democratic citizenship in education: Empowering humanity and democracy in Dutch education. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 37*(1), 105-119. doi:10.1080/03057920601061893

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of education for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269.

Wood, B. E. (2014). Participatory capital: Bourdieu and citizenship education in diverse school communities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 35*(4), 578-597. doi:10.1080/01425692.2013.777209

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (8th ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Yiğit, E. Ö. (2017). Sosyal bilgiler öğretmen adaylarının gözünden vatandaşlık ve Türk vatandaşlığı. *İlköğretim Online, 16*(2), 406-406. doi:10.17051/ilkonline.2017.304708

Appendix 1. Demographic Characteristics of Panelists Participating in the Second Delphi Round

Variables	Field of expertise	n	%
Academician	Social Studies Education (Citizenship Education)	11	2,27
	Educational Sciences	2	2,27
	History Education	1	2,27
	Communication Sciences (journalism and media studies)	1	2,27
	International Relations	1	2,27
	Political Science	1	2,27
	Philosophy (moral and educational philosophy)	1	25,0
	Basic Education	1	2,27
	Sociology (political science)	1	4,54
	Education Policies	1	2,27
Independent Researcher	Political Science	1	2,27
	Education Policies	1	2,27
School Administrator	Social Studies Teacher	2	4,54
	Political Science	1	2,27
Teacher	Social Studies Instr.	11	25,0
	Turkish Language Teaching	2	4,54
	Information Technologies Teacher	1	2,27
	first-grade teacher	3	6,81
	Preschool Teacher	1	2,27
		44	**100**
Title	Professor	5	11,3
	Associate Professor	7	11,5
	Assistant Professor	7	11,5
	Dr. Reseach assistant	1	2,27
	Dr. Lecturer	1	2,27
	Dr.	3	13,6
	Teacher has PHd	3	13,6
	Teacher	17	38,6
Gender	Kadın	21	47,72
	Erkek	23	52,28
Age	21-25	-	-
	26-30	2	4,54
	31-35	9	20,5
	36-40	14	31,8
	41-45	12	27,3
	46-50	1	2,27
	51-55	4	9,09
	56-60	1	2,27
	61 and over	1	2,27
Professional Seniority	1-5 years	4	9,09
	6-10 years	6	13,6
	11-15 years	12	27,3
	16-20 years	9	20,5
	21-25 years	8	18,2
	26- years and over	5	11,3
		44	**100**