

The acquisition levels of the responsibility projected in primary education 8th class students' curriculums¹

Enver Sahan

Ahi Evran University, Social Science Institute, Kırşehir/Turkey

Rüştü Yeşil*

Ahi Evran University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Science, Kırşehir/Turkey

Present study aims to detect the acquisition levels of the responsibility training projected in primary education eighth class students' curriculums. This is a descriptive and quantitative research executed via scanning model. Research data have been compiled from total 289 students in eighth class within 15 primary education schools in Kırşehir city center as well as 93 teachers. Research data have been obtained via "Personal Information Form" and the scale developed by researchers. Arithmetic means (\bar{X}), standard deviation (Ss), independent sampling t test, variance analysis (ANOVA) and LSD tests have been conducted on the data. $p>0,05$ level has been the acknowledged level of significance. At the end of research it has been concluded that students consider themselves in a better position compared to their teachers; while income levels bring about meaningful differentiations in student evaluations, in teacher evaluations no differentiation with respect to independent variables has been met. It has also been detected that particular emphasis should be rendered to improve Social and Academic responsibilities of students particularly.

Keywords: Responsibility, responsibility training, curriculum, acquisition, primary education

Introduction

Leading a social life, the individual affects both himself/herself in addition to his/her surrounding with words and acts. The social interaction performed by the individual forces this person to be adaptable as well (Sidekli, 2010). Otherwise, as Samuk (1992) reports, it is possible to encounter a number of conflicts in this person as well as in society. In order to be able to adapt as well as ensure happiness, the individual is expected to be ascertainli abilities in all stages of life. The general term for these liabilities is "responsibility".

It has been acknowledged that a significant feature that distinguishes men from other beings is sense of responsibility which is a prerequisite to guarantee the continuity and blissfulness of society (Yeşil, 2003; MEB, 2006; K1sa, 2009). Önal (2005) states that a remarkable share of problems faced in society today stems from the failure of people to perform fully their responsibilities. However responsibility is a learnt subject and an educational problem basically. Thus it can reasonably be argued that responsibility training is one of the prerequisites of establishing personal

¹This research was produced from Enver Şahan's master thesis.

* Correspondence: Ahi Evran University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Science, Kırşehir/Turkey

and social peace through gaining an awareness of responsibility to the individual.

As relevant literature is analyzed it grabs attention of reader that many factors influential on responsibility training have been mentioned. Some researchers point to the significance of family in responsibility training (Baker and Soden, 1998; Cüceloğlu, 1999) while others emphasize the gravity of school (Yurtal and Yontar, 2006; Altun and Çakan, 2008; Önal, 2005). The rest of researchers on the other hand put their fingers on the effect of extra-school setting in responsibility training (Özen, 2001; Naftchi-Ardebili, 1995; Başaran, 1974; Küçükahmet, 2005). In addition to all the above, certain researchers have focused on responsibilities of institutions on society and individuals (Yönet, 2005; Ulu, 2007; İbrahim, Angelidis and Howard, 2006). From this point onwards it can be alleged that responsibility training covers any place people build interaction and any person involved. Besides it has been detected that the most frequently mentioned settings in responsibility training are family and school (Keçeli-Kaysılı, 2008; Marshall, 2005; Gümüşeli, 2004). School and family are acknowledged as the two institutions of which educational function supersedes the rest of their functions (Hamby, 1992).

Family is the primary institution responsible for the care, development and education of the child; teaching individuals about their rights and responsibilities (Kısa, 2009; Işık and Maya, 2003; Yeşil, 2003). In literature it has been widely mentioned the negative effects of authoritarian, negligent or over-protective families in gaining responsibility awareness to children (Başaran, 1974; Cüceloğlu, 1999; Özen, 2001). Schools on the other hand possess a distinctive position since they are the kind of settings where responsibility training is provided by means of specific curriculums within a definite plan in a unique learning environment through professional educators. Nonetheless considering the fact that parents are also raised in schools, it can be argued that in responsibility-training schools shoulder remarkably greater task.

A significant number of researchers advocate that the general objective of school and education is to assist the children, youngsters and even themselves in adapting the change and society in the proper and beneficial way (Sezer, 2008; Ünlü and Aydos, 2010; Katrancı, 2008; Karadağ, 2010; Kısa, 2009; Sadık, 2006). Additionally 1739 no National Education Basic Law states that it is one of the main objectives of education to gain sense of responsibility to citizens as well raise citizens endowed with an awareness of responsibility (MEB *The Ministry of National Education*, 2006; Kınca, 2004).

Responsibility feeling starts to reveal itself during childhood with the effect of attitudes and skills in family and learnt through experiences (Babadoğan, 2003; Yurtal and Yontar, 2006; Yontar, 2007). Based on this fact it can be asserted that responsibility training should start in young ages so far as possible, even as early as pre-school period. Indeed a noticeable number of scientists today share the same belief (Glasser, 1999; Kısa, 2009; Taylı, 2006; Yurtal and Yontar, 2006; Balat, Beceren and Özdemir, 2011; Yeşil, 2003).

Babadoğan (2003) reports that responsibility training constitutes a noteworthy part of each stage of education in all educational institutions from primary schools to universities which all follow a scheduled training. Nonetheless it is of common knowledge that preschool education is not yet as widespread as expected in Turkey. Hence as regards responsibility training, primary education takes the stage by virtue of being compulsory and its accessibility throughout the country to all individuals at this age.

A variety of cognitive, affective and psychomotor features mostly take form during primary education stage (Kolaç, 2003; Yeşil, 2002). As we analyze the theories exploring stages of development in humans we grasp that personality formation is completed to a great extent till age

15 (Erden and Akman, 1996; Senemoğlu, 2007). Based on this finding it can be asserted that it becomes harder to gain responsibility awareness to individuals parallel to the upwards movement in stages of education. Shafer (1987) describes primary education level as the institution in charge of gaining responsibility to children and it is endowed with special qualities on its own. On accounts of such reasons primary education stage is deemed to play more significant role than all the other institutions in responsibility training.

In Turkish National Education system there is not a specific course as responsibility training. Responsibility training is scattered through different curriculums. It can be assumed that the reason explaining such practice is that sense of responsibility is actually a kind of notion surrounding all stages and phases of life. That is why responsibility training is encountered in the acquisitions, context, activities, measurement-evaluation sections of different curriculums. However the fact that it is also present in learning objectives part of curriculums-acquisitions part- is noteworthy as it enlightens the target aimed at the end of this practice.

On the other hand the changes that occur in people's needs, thoughts and lifestyles in the course of life may also be effective in changing the human profile aimed at the end of training which necessitates to amend or improve educational programs in line with changing needs and conditions. Sünbül (2010) points out that a changed program is not a "finished, completed" program; he expresses that the application shall be developed under a scientific approach that takes the needs of social development into consideration. To detect the acquisition levels of the responsibility training projected in primary education eighth class students' curriculums constitutes the main problem of current research.

Problem statement

To what extent did primary education 8th class students gain the responsibility training acquisitions projected in their own curriculums?

Research objective

The main objective of present study is to detect to what extent primary education 8th class students (senior students) have gained the responsibility training acquisitions projected in their own curriculums. In that way it has been aimed to explore curriculum-based problems in the subject of responsibility training and also to obtain scientific data that can be used as pre-information for prospective curriculum-development studies.

Within the framework of this general objective present research have been seeking answers for below stated questions primarily:

As regards the levels of achieving the acquisitions of responsibility training set within eighth class students' curriculums,

- What do teachers and students think?
- Is there a difference of opinions between teachers and students?
- Do teacher evaluations vary with respect to gender, work experience and fields?
- Do student evaluations vary with respect to gender and family income levels?

Method

This is a descriptive and quantitative research.

Research Model

The research has been conducted in scanning model. It has been attempted to describe the opinions of teachers and students as regards acquisition levels of primary education eighth class students as regards all responsibility acquisitions set in their curriculums.

Research Universe and Sampling

The universe of present research consists of 8th class students educated in 30 state primary education institutes in Kırşehir city center and the teachers of these students. 289 8th class students from total 15 primary schools and 93 teachers make up the sampling of research. 143 students in sampling group are girls, 146 students are boys; 37 teachers are women and 56 are men.

Data Collection Tools and Data Collection

Research data have been collected via “Acquisition-Based Responsibility Level Detection Scale (ABRLDS)” and “Personal Information Form (PIF)” prepared separately for teachers and students.

Personal Information Form consists of six questions directed to students (gender, class level, mother’s education, father’s education, father’s profession, financial status of family); and four questions for teachers (gender, class level, professional seniority, field).

ABRLDS has been developed by the researcher in line with the responsibility acquisitions stated under curriculums and consists of total 28 items listed under five factors. 5 Likert type options have been put for each item to detect teachers’ and students’ opinions. These options are listed and graded such; (1) “I am very good at it”, (2) “I am good at it”, (3) “I am in middle level”, (4) “I am bad at it” and (5) “I am rather bad at it”.

The validity analysis of data has revealed that KMO value of ABRLDS is 0,956; Bartlett’s test value is $p=0,000$; factor loads of items vary between 0,451-0,820. The items in scale explain 66,239% of total variance. Reliability analysis of scale has been detected via calculating Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency coefficients for factors as well as the whole scale and as presented in Table 1:

Table 1. Scale’s Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for factors and whole scale

Dimensions	Item Numbers	Cronbach’s Alpha
Social Responsibility (SR)	6	0,859
Joint Responsibility (JR)	5	0,856
Personal Responsibility (PR)	5	0,830
Religious Responsibility (RR)	6	0,893
Academic Responsibility (AR)	6	0,901
General Mean	28	0,960

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Arithmetic means (\bar{x}), standard deviation (Ss), independent sampling t test, one-way variance analysis (Anova) and LSD tests have been applied on the data collected to seek answers to the questions stated in research objectives part. $p<0,05$ has been the acknowledged level of significance. In data analysis, since the answers of students were gathered from five-level scale, arithmetic means intervals: Arithmetic means intervals have been calculated via;

Arithmetic means interval = $\frac{\text{Interval Numbers}}{\text{Options Numbers}}$ formula. Accordingly arithmetic means intervals and their interpretations can be summarized as below:

Very good	: 4,21-5,00
Good	: 3,41-4,20
Middle	: 2,61-3,40
Poor	: 1,81-2,60
Very poor	: 1,00-1,80

Research findings have been exemplified through tables below.

Findings

With respect to sub-dimensions, teacher and student opinions regarding the level of responsibility acquisition of eighth class students have been analyzed. Subsequently the differentiation between teacher and student opinions with respect to factors has been examined and relevant findings are as demonstrated in Table 2 – Table 8.

Teacher and Student Opinions regarding Responsibility Acquisition Levels of Students:

Table 2.Teacher and student opinions regarding social dimension responsibility acquisition of levels of eighth class students

Item	Social Responsibility Acquisitions		N	\bar{x}	Ss	Level
1.	I exert the required amount of effort to achieve my plans in selection of profession	Student	287	4,26	,89	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,30	,76	Middle
2.	I am well aware of the social importance of intellectual, artistic and literary works	Student	285	4,16	,86	Good
		Teacher	21	3,14	,91	Middle
3.	I believe in the necessity to protect and appreciate intellectual, artistic and literary works	Student	283	4,28	,95	Very good
		Teacher	22	3,55	,86	Good
4.	I am sensitive to protecting the basic tenets of Turkish Republic	Student	282	4,40	,84	Very good
		Teacher	23	4,09	,95	Good
5.	I am aware that science and technology applications can create major impacts for the individual, society and environment	Student	287	4,25	,70	Very good
		Teacher	22	3,45	,67	Middle
6.	I have faith in democracy while reaching a decision on any given situation	Student	286	4,21	,89	Very good
		Teacher	22	3,64	,95	Good

In Table 2 it has been exhibited that student evaluations regarding the “Social Dimension” responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students vary between $\bar{x}=4,16$ and $\bar{x}=4,40$; teacher evaluations vary between $\bar{x}=3,14$ and $\bar{x}=4,09$. Students and teachers regard that students are the most sufficient in 4th acquisition and the least sufficient in 2nd acquisition.

Table 3.Teacher and student opinions regarding joint dimension responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students

Item	Joint Responsibility Acquisitions		N	\bar{x}	Ss	Level
1.	I know that freedom of communication should be respected	Student	287	4,49	,78	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,87	,69	Good
2.	I respect people’s private lives	Student	288	4,68	,70	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,61	,89	Good

3.	I keep away from the kind of attitudes and acts that might harm others' freedom of communication	Student	289	4,43	,81	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,78	,67	Good
4.	I try hard to live neat and healthy	Student	287	4,62	,71	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,70	,93	Good
5.	I finish all my deeds in a timely manner	Student	287	4,10	,90	Good
		Teacher	23	3,22	,90	Middle

In Table 3 it has been exhibited that student evaluations regarding the “Joint Dimension” responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students vary between $\bar{x}=4,10$ and $\bar{x}=4,68$; teacher evaluations vary between $\bar{x}=3,22$ and $\bar{x}=3,87$. Students grade themselves best in 2nd acquisition, the worst in 5th acquisition; teachers grade their students best in 1st acquisition and worst in 5th acquisition.

Table 4.Teacher and student opinions regarding personal dimension responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students

Item	Personal Responsibility Acquisitions		N	\bar{x}	Ss	Level
1.	I am into regular sport activities to lead a healthy life	Student	284	4,21	,97	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,52	,90	Good
2.	I value success in sport activities and appreciate the winners	Student	284	4,34	,98	Very good
		Teacher	22	3,59	,73	Good
3.	I voluntarily participate in sport activities and fulfill my responsibilities	Student	282	4,32	,91	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,78	,67	Good
4.	I care about taking part in sport organizations	Student	280	4,25	,99	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,78	,80	Good
5.	I stick to the rules in sport activities	Student	284	4,34	,91	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,70	,76	Good

In Table 4 it has been exhibited that student evaluations regarding the “Personal Dimension” responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students vary between $\bar{x}=4,21$ and $\bar{x}=4,34$; teacher evaluations vary between $\bar{x}=3,52$ and $\bar{x}=3,78$. Students grade themselves best in 2nd and 5th acquisitions, the worst in 1st acquisition while teachers grade their students best in the 3rd and 4th acquisitions and worst in 1st acquisition.

Table 5.Teacher and student opinions regarding religious dimension responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students

Item	Religious Responsibility Acquisitions		N	\bar{x}	Ss	Level
1.	I know that trust in Allah is not simply passive lethargy	Student	285	4,68	,65	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,78	,67	Good
2.	I am aware that sharing and giving is a religious task	Student	285	4,59	,72	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,74	,75	Good
3.	I am aware that protecting the nature and animals is a religious task	Student	285	4,50	,79	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,70	,76	Good
4.	I am aware that being a moral person matters for the individual as well society	Student	286	4,44	,86	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,91	,85	Good
5.	I am aware of the important place Islam preserves amongst divine religions	Student	283	4,53	,88	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,96	,77	Good

6.	I am aware of the global significance of universal messages conveyed by Islam and other religions	Student	285	4,40	,86	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,83	,72	Good

In Table 5 it has been exhibited that student evaluations regarding the “Religious Dimension” responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students vary between $\bar{x}=4,40$ and $\bar{x}=4,68$; teacher evaluations vary between $\bar{x}=3,70$ and $\bar{x}=3,96$. Students grade themselves best in 1st acquisition, the worst in 6th acquisition while teachers grade students best in 5th acquisition and worst in 3rd acquisition.

Table 6.Teacher and student opinions regarding academic dimension responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students

Item	Academic Responsibility Acquisitions		N	\bar{x}	Ss	Level
1.	I pay heeds to the rules of Turkish language in speaking and writing	Student	287	4,02	,93	Good
		Teacher	23	3,39	,84	Middle
2.	I listen in silence when someone else speaks	Student	284	4,44	,77	Very good
		Teacher	22	3,09	1,02	Middle
3.	I follow courtesy rules while talking	Student	283	4,24	,92	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,13	,97	Middle
4.	I pay heeds to orthographic rules, page order and neatness while writing	Student	285	4,22	,97	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,26	,92	Middle
5.	I stick to orthographic rules in writing	Student	282	4,07	1,03	Good
		Teacher	22	3,23	1,07	Middle
6.	I deliver speech without disturbing the others	Student	284	4,37	,87	Very good
		Teacher	23	3,39	,99	Middle

In Table 6 it has been exhibited that student evaluations regarding the “Academic Dimension” responsibility acquisition levels of eighth class students vary between $\bar{x}=4,02$ and $\bar{x}=4,44$; teacher evaluations vary between $\bar{x}=3,09$ and $\bar{x}=3,39$. Students grade themselves best in 2nd acquisition, the worst in 1st acquisition while teachers grade students best in the 1st and 6th acquisitions and the worst in 2nd acquisition.

As the mean of evaluations is taken it then surfaces that student evaluations are within level $\bar{x}=4,23$; teacher evaluations are within level $\bar{x}=3,25$. It is thus concluded that with respect to academic responsibility acquisition levels, there is a significant differentiation between teacher and student opinions. Teachers in particular deem that students are not in sufficient level.

Table 7.With respect to factors the differentiation between teacher and student opinions on eighth class students’ responsibility acquisition levels

Dimensions		N	\bar{x}	Ss	Levene F	p	t	sd	p
Social Responsibility	Student	270	4,27	,63	,680	,410	5,296	288	,000
	Teacher	20	3,49	,65					
Religious Responsibility	Student	277	4,53	,58	,041	,840	5,591	298	,000
	Teacher	23	3,82	,61					
Academic Responsibility	Student	272	4,23	,68	3,333	,069	6,235	291	,000
	Teacher	21	3,25	,87					
Personal Responsibility	Student	273	4,30	,69	2,118	,147	3,895	293	,000

	Teacher	22	3,71	,56					
Joint Responsibility	Student	284	4,46	,56	1,070	,302	6,745	305	,000
	Teacher	23	3,63	,66					
General Mean	Student	241	4,36	,51	,576	,449	6,643	259	,000
	Teacher	20	3,56	,57					

In Table7 it has been exhibited that student evaluations regarding eighth class students' responsibility acquisition levels with respect to factors vary between $\bar{X}=4,23$ and $\bar{X}=4,53$; teacher evaluations vary between $\bar{X}=3,25$ and $\bar{X}=3,82$. Both students and teachers grade students best in "religious responsibility" sub-dimension and the worst in "academic responsibility" sub-dimension. On the other hand student and teacher evaluations differ meaningfully in all sub-dimensions ($p<,05$). In all sub-dimensions students regard themselves in a better position compared to their teachers. This finding may be related to the fact that that compared to students teachers are more capable of making realistic evaluations whereas students have problems in expressing their own failures objectively.

Additionally a series of descriptive variables that may be effective on students' responsibility acquisition levels have been explored. These variables are; teachers' term of service, gender and field; students' gender, educational status of students' parents, father's profession and monthly income levels of families.

In students' opinions regarding responsibility acquisition levels, no significant differentiation has been detected with respect to father's profession, educational status of parents ($p> 0,05$). However regarding students' perceptions on responsibility acquisition levels with respect to family income, aside from "Academic Responsibility" and "Joint Responsibility" sub-dimensions, meaningful differentiations have been detected in all factors. LSD test has been performed to detect the source of differentiation in students' opinions; obtained findings have been summarized in Table 8:

Table 8.With respect to monthly family income the opinions of eight class students on responsibility acquisition levels

	Income	N	\bar{X}	Ss		KT	Df	KO	F	p	LSD
Religious Responsibility	1.0-500	61	4,33	,68	Between Groups	6,504	4	1,626			
	2.500-1000	110	4,66	,46	Within Groups	82,800	260	,318			1-2
	3.1000-2000	79	4,57	,49	Total	89,304	264		5,106	,001	1-3
	4.2000-3000	11	4,55	,46							2-5
	5.And More	4	3,79	1,87							3-5
	Total	265	4,54	,58							4-5
Academic Responsibility	1.0-500	60	4,21	,69	Between Groups	1,197	4	,299			
	2.500-1000	106	4,32	,64	Within Groups	119,932	254	,472			
	3.1000-2000	78	4,21	,73	Total	121,130	258		,634	,639	---
	4.2000-3000	11	4,05	,76							
	5. And More	4	4,29	,55							
	Total	259	4,25	,69							
Social Responsibility	1.0-500	58	4,02	,79	Between Groups	6,580	4	1,645			
	2.500-1000	109	4,42	,50	Within Groups	91,465	253	,362			
	3.1000-2000	76	4,26	,56	Total	98,045	257		4,550	,001	1-2
	4.2000-3000	11	4,44	,55							1-3
	5. And More	4	4,42	,87							1-4
	Total	258	4,28	,62							

Joint Responsibility	1.0-500	64	4,39	,70	Between Groups	1,048	4	,262		
	2.500-1000	113	4,52	,50	Within Groups	82,840	267	,310		
	3.1000-2000	79	4,43	,51	Total	83,888	271		,845	,498
	4.2000-3000	12	4,42	,50						---
	5. And More	4	4,69	,47						
	Total	272	4,46	,56						
Personal Responsibility	1.0-500	58	4,00	,88	Between Groups	8,202	4	2,050		
	2.500-1000	108	4,44	,56	Within Groups	113,517	255	,445		
	3.1000-2000	78	4,32	,66	Total	121,719	259		4,606	,001
	4.2000-3000	12	4,20	,45						1-2
	5. And More	4	4,75	,19						1-3
	Total	260	4,30	,69						1-5
General Mean	1.0-500	49	4,19	,67	Between Groups	71,306	4	17,826		
	2.500-1000	95	4,46	,43	Within Groups	26,743	272	,098		
	3.1000-2000	72	4,36	,43	Total	28,102	276		2,464	,046
	4.2000-3000	9	4,39	,44						1-2
	5. And More	4	4,39	,63						
	Total	229	4,36	,49						

As demonstrated in Table 8, except “Academic Responsibility” and “Joint Responsibility” sub-dimensions significant differentiations have been detected in all factors. As regards “Religious Dimension” students whose average monthly family incomes vary between 500-1000 TL and 1000-2000 TL see themselves more responsible when compared to students with 0-500 TL average monthly family income. Students whose average monthly family incomes exceed 3000 TL have been the ones who grade themselves the worst.

In “Social Dimension” students with 500-1000, 1000-2000 and 2000-3000 TL monthly income have graded themselves higher than students with 0-500 TL income level.

In “Personal Dimension” students with 500-1000, 1000-2000 TL and above 3000 TL monthly income have graded themselves as more responsible compared to students with 0-500 TL income level.

According to general mean, students with 500-1000 TL monthly income view themselves as more responsible compared to students with 0-500 TL income level.

There is a significant difference on behalf of females at all factors apart from Personal and Academic dimensions in perceptions about the level of responsibility acquisition according to the gender of students. Findings which express the direction and dimension of differentiation are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Views of students upon their level of performing responsibility acquisition according to their gender

Dimensions	Gender	N	\bar{x}	Ss	t	sd	p																				
Religious Responsibility	Male	140	4,43	,60	-2,984	274	,003																				
	Female	136	4,63	,55				Academic Responsibility	Male	135	4,19	,72	-1,177	269	,240	Female	136	4,29	,64	Social Responsibility	Male	132	4,17	,66	-2,370	267	,018
Academic Responsibility	Male	135	4,19	,72	-1,177	269	,240																				
	Female	136	4,29	,64				Social Responsibility	Male	132	4,17	,66	-2,370	267	,018	Female	137	4,36	,59								
Social Responsibility	Male	132	4,17	,66	-2,370	267	,018																				
	Female	137	4,36	,59																							

Joint Responsibility	Male	143	4,35	,59	-3,005	282	,003
	Female	141	4,55	,49			
Personal Responsibility	Male	136	4,30	,69	,141	270	,888
	Female	136	4,29	,69			
General Mean	Male	120	4,29	2,96	-2,060	238	,041
	Female	120	4,42	2,51			

In Table 9 it is seen that between the levels of performing responsibility acquisition of students; there is a significant difference at Religious, Common and Social dimensions according to the gender; female students regard themselves more responsible than male students at all dimensions.

Teachers' evaluations on students' responsibility acquisition levels have been analyzed with respect to several variables. Accordingly for any of the factors, there is no significant differentiation amidst teacher evaluations with respect to gender, terms of service or field ($p>0,05$).

Conclusion and Discussion

The findings obtained in present research have been discussed below:

1. As regards responsibility-related acquisitions level, with respect to all factors, students grade themselves higher than their teachers do. Students grade themselves as "very good" in all factors while teachers grade students "middle" in Academic Responsibility factor and "good" in the rest of factors. With respect to all factors student and teacher evaluations differ meaningfully and this finding may be related to the fact that that compared to students teachers are more capable of making realistic evaluations whereas students have problems in expressing their own failures objectively.

Religious Responsibility factor is the one both teachers and students agree that students have the highest level of acquisition which may be attributed to the fact that research group is composed of Central Anatolia inhabitants where traditions are dominant. Additionally the facts that Kırşehir is a scarcely populated city (109000) with low industrialization and backward to allow the flourish of tourism which enables intercultural interactions may also be effective in driving students to act more religiously responsible.

On the other hand academic responsibility factor is the one both teachers and students agree that students have the lowest level of acquisition which may be attributed to the fact that both teachers and students have unmet expectation levels as regards school success and learning responsibilities. The facts that Kırşehir achieves substantially high scores in national exams; students, parents and teachers are all convinced that the road to a good future is only through education since there are limited options for other job opportunities may be the initiators raising academic expectations and making students' performance seem below expectations.

2. It has been detected that teachers' evaluations on students do not vary significantly with respect to variables such as gender, field or professional seniority. Accordingly it can be asserted that regardless of their seniority teachers all possess similar backgrounds, thoughts and criteria. As an outcome of "Mixed Education" and "Equal Opportunities in Education" principles brought into force with 1739 no National Education Basic Law throughout all places in the country both girls and boys are entitled to receive the same education under similar conditions in similar educational institutions following equal curriculums. Besides the joint courses received in undergraduate education, the resemblances between the regions they work in and students they evaluate may also have been effective in creating similar judgments as regards students' responsibility levels. It can also be argued that the similarity amidst teachers may also have been reflected in the information,

criteria and ways of thinking they apply in evaluation. This reality may become an obstacle stopping the effects of variables on teachers' evaluation of students' responsibility perceptions.

It is seen that there is a significant difference at Religious, Common and Social dimensions in the assessment of students according to gender; female students perform more responsible behaviors compared to male students. This resulted may result from the upbringing of female and male students. While female children are expected to become domestic, responsible individual who are given workload; male children are left free and abstain from responsibility (Çetin and Aksu, 2010: 128). It is especially expressed that women having more and heavier social responsibility enabled them to have more developed sense of responsibility (Kayserili and Gündoğdu, 2010). As a result according to this study it is seen that the variable of gender influence sense of responsibility of students on behalf of female students.

3. It is feasible to argue that parallel to the rise in family income, families get more capable of meeting the needs and cares of their children. In that case it is expected that as family income level rises, so do students' responsibility perceptions. Yet this expectation could be met fully only in Personal Responsibility dimension; in the rest of factors although an increase is observed parallel to income rise it has been noted that students with highest income levels do not occupy the highest level. These students have reached the highest level in Personal Responsibility factor alone. The students with highest income levels have received middle scores in Social Responsibility dimension, in Religious Responsibility dimension on the other hand these students attract notice as the ones with the lowest level of responsibility acquisition. Students with 500-1000 TL income level are graded as the ones with highest responsibility perception with respect to Religious Responsibility dimension and general evaluation which is also an unexpected and striking finding. As regards students' responsibility perception related to Academic Responsibility and Joint Responsibility dimensions however no differentiation has been detected with respect to family income levels.

It can be argued that families with favorable income levels overfeed the demands of their kids which may be effective in eliminating students' worries related to their future or academic success. It is also a remarkable finding that in fulfilling their academic responsibilities, income levels of students have no effect at all. It can be alleged that since the exams are mostly academic, all parents who are worried about the future of their children pay close attention to academic success. This may be an explanation for the finding that once the situation is related to academic responsibilities, students remain unaffected by financial conditions.

Suggestions

Based on research findings, below-stated suggestions can be rendered:

1. In curriculums certain measurements should be taken to elevate mainly students' levels of academic responsibility fulfillment. Within this framework particular emphasis should be given to strengthen reading habits of students, to lead them to prepare their papers and researches timely and properly, to motivate them to follow scientific and artistic literary works.
2. The reasons that are effective in delaying students' timely presentations should be probed into and proper measurements should be taken to stop such lags. In line with that it would be beneficial if teachers and parents followed the assignments and academic works of students more closely and assist students with appropriate and understandable feedbacks.
3. In educational practices, male students should be more elaborated than females about providing acquisitions especially at "Legal" and "Social" dimensions.

4. The reasons why income levels of families are not determiners on students' responsibility perceptions and responsible acts with respect to Academic Responsibility and Joint Responsibility dimensions should be investigated. The kind of researches that can be conducted to ensure that high income level families contribute positively to Academic Responsibility and Joint Responsibility perceptions of students should be put on the agenda. It can also be suggested that financial support be rendered to students with low income levels in particular. In addition to all above, the reasons why responsibility perception levels of high income level students fail the expectations should also be searched. The factors pulling Religious Responsibility perceptions of these families lower than the other students should also be analyzed.

5. On the other hand present study is restricted with primary education 8th class students and teachers within the schools in Kırşehir city center. Similar researches can be conducted in different cities with dissimilar financial, geographical and cultural assets and other primary education classes as well. It should also be noted that inclusion of administrators and parents within the scope of sampling would contribute to attaining more consistent results. Besides it can also be suggested that relevant studies may be conducted to cover secondary education and higher education stages.

References

- Altun, S. A. and Çakan, M. (2008). Öğrencilerin sınav başarılarına etki eden faktörler: LGS/ÖSS Sınavlarındaki başarılı iller örneği. *İlköğretim Online*, 7(1), 157-173.
- Babadoğan, C. (2003). Sorumlu davranış geliştirme stratejileri bağlamında öğrenen sınıf. *Ankara: Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 157.
- Baker, A. J. L. and Soden, L. M. (1998). The challenges of parent involvement research," Tech. Rep. ERIC/CUE Digest Number 134, *ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education*, New York.
- Balat, G. U.; Beceren, B. Ö. and Özdemir A. A. (2011). The evaluation of parents' views related to helping pre-school childrengainsome universal value. *Academic World Education & Research Center. 3rd World Conference on Educational Sciences*. 03.02.2011'de [.http://www.worldeducationcenter.eu/index.php/wces/wces2011/paper/view/2379](http://www.worldeducationcenter.eu/index.php/wces/wces2011/paper/view/2379) adresinden indirilmiştir.
- Başaran, İ. E. (1974). *Eğitim psikolojisi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Cüceloğlu, D. (1999). *İçimizdeki çocuk*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Çetin, N. and Aksu, M. B. (2010). İlköğretim 4-8. Sınıf (10-14 Yaş) Öğrencilerinin Televizyon İzleme Profili. *Ankara: Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 39(187).
- Erden-Akman, Y. (1996). *Eğitim psikolojisi: Gelişim-öğrenme-öğretme*. Ankara: Arkadaş Yayınları.
- Glasser, W. (1999). *Başarısızlığın olmadığı okul*. (Çev. Teksöz, K.) Ankara: Beyaz Yayınları. 17/07/2010'de <http://www.amazon.com/Reality-Therapy-pproach-PsychiatryColophon/dp/0060904143> adresinden indirilmiştir.
- Gümüşeli, A. İ. (2004). Aile katılım ve desteğinin öğrenci başarısına etkisi. *Özel Okullar Birliği Bülteni*. 2(6), 14-17.
- Hamby, J. V. (1992). The school-family link: a key to dropout prevention. *Education and The Family*. (Edited by Leonard Kaplan). Allyn and Bacon A Division of Simon and Schuster. Inc. 160 Gould Street, Massachusetts: 55-68.
- Işık, H. and Maya, İ. (2003). Taşınmalı ilköğretim uygulaması ve bu uygulamaya son verilmesiyle ilgili veli görüşleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 11(2), 285-296.

- İbrahim, N. A; Angelidis, J. P. and Howard D. P. (2006). Corporatesocialresponsibility: A comparativeanalysis of perceptions of practicingaccountants and accountingstudents. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66, 157-167.
- Karadağ, N. (2010). İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin etkili okul bağlamında olası bir okul merkezli yönetim uygulamasına ilişkin rol ve sorumluluk algıları: Adıyaman ili örneği. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gaziantep Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gaziantep, Türkiye.
- Katrancı, M. (2008). Öğretmenlik uygulamasında uygulama okulu koordinatörleri ve uygulama öğretmenlerinin görev ve sorumluluklarını yerine getirme düzeyleri: Kırıkkale ili örneği. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kırıkkale, Türkiye.
- Kayserili, T. A. and Gündoğdu, K. (2010). Okul Öncesi Öğretmenleri Ve Öğretmen Adaylarının Mesleğe İlişkin Tutumları ile Duygusal Zekaları Arasındaki İlişki.*Ankara: Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 39(187), 104-120.
- Keçeli-Kaysılı B. (2008). Akademik başarının arttırılmasında aile katılımı. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Özel Eğitim Dergisi*, 9 (1), 69-83.
- Kıncal, R. Y. (2004). *Vatandaşlık bilgisi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Kısa, D. (2009). Okulöncesi öğretmenlerinin altı yaş çocuklarının sorumluluk eğitiminde başvurdukları disiplin yöntemlerine ilişkin görüşleri. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın, Türkiye.
- Kolaç, E. (2003). İlköğretim dördüncü sınıf Türkçe ders kitaplarının öğretmen görüşlerine dayalı olarak değerlendirilmesi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 17(1), 105-137.
- Küçükahmet, L. (2005). *Sınıf yönetimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Marshall, M. (2005). Disciplinewithoutstress, punishmentsorrewards. *TheClearing House*, 79(1), 51-54.
- MEB (2006). *İlköğretim programı*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınevi.
- Naftchi-Ardebili,S. (1995). Parents' views of theirinvolvement at home, in eseachapter 1 programs, and school: Impact on parents and theirchildren. *TheAnnual Meeting of theAmerican Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA*, 18(22), 143-150.
- Önal, Ş. H. (2005). Bir sorumluluk eğitim programının lise dokuzuncu sınıf öğrencilerinin sorumluluk düzeylerine etkisi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Bursa, Türkiye.
- Özen, Y. (2001). *Yarına kalmak adına sorumluluk eğitimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Sadık, F.(2006). Öğrencilerin istenmeyen davranışları ve bu davranışlarla baş edilme stratejilerinin öğretmen, öğrenci ve veli görüşlerine göre incelenmesi ve güven disiplin modeli temele alınarak uygulanan eğitim programının öğretmenlerin baş etme stratejilerine etkisi. Yayınlanmamışdoktora tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana, Türkiye.
- Samuk, F. (1992). İnsan ruh sağlığı ve çevre.*Ekoloji Dergisi*, 30(4), 23-25.
- Senemoğlu, N. (2007). *Gelişim, öğrenme ve öğretim*. Ankara: Gönül Yayıncılık.
- Sezer, T. (2008). İlköğretim 6. Sınıf Sosyal Bilgiler Dersinde Sorumluluk Değerinin Öğretimine İlişkin Öğretmen Görüşleri. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, Türkiye.

- Shafer, F. (1987). Human rights education in schools. *Human Rights and Education*. (Edt.: Norma Bernstein Tarrow). New York: Pergamon Press, 191-205.
- Sidekli, S. (2010). İlköğretim dördüncü ve beşinci sınıf öğrencilerinin türkçe dersi için öğretmenlerinden beklentileri. *Ankara: Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 39(187), 52-75.
- Sünbül, A. M.(2010). *Öğretim ilke ve yöntemleri*.Konya: Eğitim Kitabevi Yayınları.
- Taylı, A. (2006). Akran yardımcılığı uygulaması aracılığıyla lise öğrencilerinde kişisel ve sosyal sorumluluğun arttırılması. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara, Türkiye.
- Ulu, A. S. (2007). Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk: bir alan çalışması. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kahramanmaraş, Türkiye.
- Ünlü, H. and Aydos, L. (2010). Beden eğitimi öğretmenlerinin yeterlilikleri üzerine bir derleme. *Ankara: Milli Eğitim, Dergisi*, 39(187), 172-191.
- Yeşil, R. (2002). *Okul ve ailede insan hakları ve demokrasi eğitimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Yeşil, R. (2003). Sorumluluk bilincinin gelişmesine okul ve ailenin etkisi. *Eğitim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 10, 175-183.
- Yönet, E. (2005). Kurumsal sosyal sorumluluk anlayışında son dönemeç: Stratejik sorumluluk. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*. 8(13), 239-264.
- Yontar, A. (2007). Sorumluluk eğitiminde ceza uygulamalarına ilişkin ilköğretim 5. sınıf öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşlerinin incelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana, Türkiye.
- Yurtal, F. and Yontar, A. (2006). Sınıf öğretmenlerinin öğrencilerinden bekledikleri sorumluluklar ve sorumluluk kazandırmada kullandıkları yöntemler. *Ç.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 15(2), 411-424.