**THE INVESTIGATION OF INDIVIDUAL AND GLOBAL SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY LEVELS OF SOCIAL STUDIES PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS IN TERMS OF DIFFERENT VARIABLES**

**Melek KÖRÜKCÜ[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**Zafer TANGÜLÜ[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Abstract**

The purpose of this research is to determine the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers and investigate the relationship between these attitudes in terms of different variables. The research is in survey model. The study group of the research consists of 179 pre-service teachers who studied at Social Studies Teaching Program in the Faculty of Education at Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University in the 2019-2020 academic year. Data collection tools used in the study are a Demographic Information Form, Individual Social Responsibility Scale and Global Social Responsibility Scale. The data are analysed through SPSS 20. The results of the study show that the social studies teacher candidates' levels of individual social responsibility are high while their levels of global social responsibility are at medium level. It is also found that there is a significant difference in terms of gender in favour of female pre-service teachers and that individual social responsibility levels of pre-service teachers predict their global social responsibility levels.
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**Introduction**

Responsibility is a frequently used concept in almost every aspect of daily life from the individual and organizational levels to social level. Judgmental statements such as “how irresponsible people they are” or “they are unaware of their responsibilities” are frequently heard when the responsibilities imposed on the individual are not fulfilled. Responsibility is not an innate emotion but a learned one as from early childhood. Starting with this period, individuals fulfil their assigned duties in accordance with their ages, genders, levels of development and learning. Responsible individuals share their actions and behaviours with other individuals with whom they interact and they can compromise their behaviours without hesitation when necessary. Because, the sense of responsibility requires being accountable and completing a task assigned to an individual regardless of the existing situations and conditions, which is a natural result of the relationship between the ideal rules that the society wants to achieve and the existing social reality. Responsible individuals also have the urge to finish their duties in time without waiting for exposure to any external stimulus or factor. They have the mind, the ability to make free decisions and the will to do this. People are surrounded by various responsibilities that they are obliged to fulfil in accordance with their positions in the society (Özen, 2015; Torlak, Arslan, Kök, Dalyan, Kırel, Erdemir, Özdemir, Yaman, 2008).

Responsibility is a way through which moral values are acted out. People’s efforts to live in a better world by taking care of themselves and their environments (Lickona, 1993) have increased the binding feature of responsibility. With respect to its binding force, responsibility is divided into two forms; formal responsibility and informal responsibility. Individuals’ behaviours such as fulfilling one’s role within the family, keeping the environment clean, taking care of one’s own health and supporting friends are among the non-formal responsibilities. On the other hand, formal responsibilities include behaviours such as taking responsibility for the duties assigned in the workplace, complying with the laws, paying taxes and fulfilling the civic duties (Kılıç, 2017).

Social responsibility refers to an individual's responsibility to other individuals and serves as a precaution against potential harmful effects that may result from the activities required by communal living. It is the internalisation of such behaviours as becoming a member of non-governmental organizations, acting in sharing and collaboration, dealing with the well-being and welfare of other individuals, and helping them (Çakır, 2006; Scales, Blyth, Berkas & Kielsmeier, 2000). Individual social responsibility is the contribution of individuals to the solution of the problems observed or encountered in the society with financial or intangible volunteering activities (Eraslan, 2011). People with individual social responsibilities put the benefit of the society ahead rather than protecting their own interests.

With the increasing influence of globalization since the 20th century, the difference between local and global borders has started to disappear markedly. This has increased interdependence and paved the way for intense and rapid social, political, economic, cultural and military relations. The concept of distance has gained new meanings with the effect of globalization. While an event on local basis affects another event miles away, an event that takes place on a global basis also affects the local (Giddens, 2016). Globalization has led to unifications as well as divisions, creating earthly dimensions (Bauman, 2015) which have caused the content of responsibility to be handled globally and more broadly. Global social responsibility is to act with a sense of responsibility towards nature, beings, living beings and individuals. It requires individuals to feel the responsibility of any task such as environmental cleaning and cooperation on local basis as if to cover the whole world. Achieving the desired success in fighting global problems will be enabled by individuals who internalize global social responsibility and make it a part of their personality against all negative situations affecting humanity (Secgin & Yazıcı, 2018; Özen, 2014) because responsibility is closely related to the value judgments of the society. Recognizing other individuals, respecting their values and accepting their assets are the most basic characteristics of individuals with global social responsibility (Özüpek, 2013).

Social Studies Course is related to the acquisition of skills, attitudes and knowledge about the concept of responsibility (Şirin, 2005). The purpose of the Social Studies Curriculum is to raise individuals who have adopted national and moral values by improving the competencies they have achieved at primary school, who exercise their rights and fulfil their responsibilities and who have achieved the basic skills and competencies mentioned in Turkish Qualifications Framework and particular to specific disciplines. Responsibility value is one of the root values in the Social Studies Curriculum (2018). The values that individuals have constitute the ground for effective communication with other individuals and determining their status and social positions in the society (Yazıcı, 2006; Uslu, Yazıcı and Geçgel, 2019).

The aim of this study is to determine the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers, whose job is to enable their students to gain responsibility value in primary and secondary schools. The research questions determined in accordance with this purpose are as following:

1. What are the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers?

2. Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers differ in terms of gender variable?

3. Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers differ in terms of age variable?

4. Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers differ in terms of having a foreign friend?

5. Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers affect their perceptions about globalization?

6. Do the individual social responsibility levels of pre-service teachers predict their levels of global social responsibility?

**Method**

This research, which examines the relation between the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers, is designed in survey model. Survey is a research approach that aims to describe a past or present situation as it is (Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz, & Demirel, 2010).

**Study group**

The study group of the research consists of 179 prospective teachers who continue their social studies teaching program in the Faculty of Education at Niğde Ömer Halisdemir University in the 2019-2020 academic year. The study group was selected on a voluntary basis through simple random method. The demographic information about the study group is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1. The Demographic Information about the Study Group**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Demographic Information** | | **Experiment** | |
| f | % |
| Gender | Female | 97 | 54.2 |
| Male | 82 | 45.8 |
| Grade | 1st Grade | 13 | 7.3 |
| 2nd Grade | 67 | 37.4 |
| 3rd Grade | 41 | 22.9 |
| 4th Grade | 58 | 32.4 |
| Age | Aged 20 and below | 46 | 25.7 |
| Aged 21 | 50 | 27.9 |
| Aged 22 and above | 83 | 46.4 |
| Mother’s Educational Attainment | Illiterate | 21 | 11.7 |
| Primary School | 96 | 53.6 |
| Secondary School | 33 | 18.4 |
| Lycee | 22 | 12.3 |
| University | 7 | 3.9 |
| Father’s Educational Attainment | Illiterate | 10 | 5.6 |
| Primary School | 66 | 36.9 |
| Secondary School | 37 | 20.7 |
| Lycee | 44 | 24.6 |
| University | 22 | 12.3 |
| Interest in Global Issues | Very Interested | 42 | 23.5 |
| Moderately Interested | 84 | 46.9 |
| Little Interested | 35 | 19.6 |
| Uninterested | 18 | 10.1 |
| Attending a Class on Globalization | Attended | 63 | 35.2 |
| Not Attended | 116 | 64.8 |
| Having a Foreign Friend | Yes | 80 | 44.7 |
| No | 99 | 55.3 |
| Going Abroad | Yes | 14 | 7.8 |
| No | 165 | 92.2 |

**Data Collection Tools**

Data collection tools used in the research are Demographic Information Form, “Individual Social Responsibility Scale” and “Global Social Responsibility Scale”. The scales are tested in terms of reliability and the results of the analysis are given in Table 2.

**Table 2. Reliability Test Results for Individual Social Responsibility and Global Social Responsibility Scale Sub-dimensions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scale** | **Cronbach's Alpha** |
| Individual Social Responsibility | .89 |
| Global Social Responsibility | .87 |

**Individual Social Responsibility Scale:** The Individual Social Responsibility Scale was developed by Eraslan (2011). The scale is 5-Likert type and consists of 32 items. It involves social responsibility awareness, environmental responsibility, social cooperation, sensitivity, disadvantaged group awareness, social interest, volunteerism, foresight, and social responsibility sub-dimensions. The reliability coefficient for the whole scale obtained in this research was found .89.

**Global Social Responsibility Scale:** The Global Social Responsibility Scale was developed by Başer and Kılınç (2015). The scale, which is 5-Likert type, consists of 32 items and four sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are action-oriented responsibility, ecological responsibility, altruistic responsibility and national responsibility. The reliability coefficient obtained for the entire scale in this research is .87.

**Data Analysis**

The data obtained in the research were analysed with SPSS 20. Arithmetic mean, standard deviation and standard error values regarding the levels of global and individual social responsibility were calculated within the scope of the research. The data were analysed through t-Test for unrelated samples (Independent Samples t-Test) in terms of gender and having a foreign friend. The differences between the scores of the participants in terms of age and their interests in globalization were analysed through one-way analysis of variance (One-Way ANOVA) for unrelated samples.

**FINDINGS**

**Findings about the 1st Sub-Problem**

The average standard deviation and standard error values obtained from the scales were investigated in order to find the answer to the first sub-problem of the research, "What are the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers?". The findings are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation and Standard Error Values regarding the Sub-dimensions of the Individual Social Responsibility and Global Social Responsibility Scales**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scale/Sub-Dimensions | n |  | ss | shx | Level |
| Individual Social Responsibility | 179 | 3.62 | .54 | .04 | High |
| Action-oriented Responsibility | 179 | 3.83 | .62 | .04 | High |
| Ecological Responsibility | 179 | 3.78 | .73 | .05 | High |
| Altruistic Responsibility | 179 | 3.66 | .68 | .05 | High |
| National Responsibility | 179 | 2.98 | .62 | .04 | Medium |
| Global Social Responsibility | 179 | 3.56 | .50 | .03 | High |

It is indicated in Table 3 that the pre-service teachers' average scores taken from individual social responsibility ( = 3.62) and global social responsibility scales ( = 3.56) in general and the sub-dimensions of action-oriented responsibility ( = 3.83), ecological responsibility ( = 3.78) and altruistic-responsibility ( = 3.66) were “high”. However, the levels of teacher candidates' average scores were found to be “medium” in the national responsibility dimension of the global social responsibility scale. In line with this finding, it can be said that pre-service teachers' social responsibility perceptions were developed both individually and globally.

**Findings about the 2nd Sub-Problem**

Independent Group t-Test analysis was conducted between the average scores of the pre-service teachers in order to find the answer to the second sub-problem of the study; “Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers differ in terms of gender variable?”. The findings obtained from the analysis are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Independent Group t -Test Results to Determine Whether Individual Social Responsibility and Global Social Responsibility Scale Scores Differ According to Gender Variable**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale/Sub-Dimensions** | **Groups** | n |  | ss | **shx** | **t Test** | | |
| **t** | **sd** | **p** |
| Individual Social Responsibility | Female | 97 | 3.77 | .55 | .05 | 4.19 | 177 | .000 |
| Male | 82 | 3.44 | .48 | .05 |
| Action-Oriented Responsibility | Female | 97 | 3.96 | .55 | .05 | 3.00 | 177 | .003 |
| Male | 82 | 3.69 | .66 | .07 |
| Ecological Responsibility | Female | 97 | 3.96 | .73 | .07 | 3.61 | 177 | .000 |
| Male | 82 | 3.57 | .68 | .07 |
| Altruistic-Responsibility | Female | 97 | 3.83 | .68 | .06 | 3.56 | 177 | .000 |
| Male | 82 | 3.47 | .64 | .07 |
| National Responsibility | Female | 97 | 3.02 | .61 | .06 | 1.13 | 177 | .257 |
| Male | 82 | 2.92 | .64 | .07 |
| Global Social Responsibility | Female | 97 | 3.69 | .49 | .05 | 3.84 | 177 | .000 |
| Male | 82 | 3.41 | .47 | .05 |

Table 4 indicates that the difference between the pre-service teachers' average scores taken from individual social responsibility (t(177) = 4.19; p < .001) and global social responsibility scales (t(177) = 3.84; p < .001) in general and the sub-dimensions of action-oriented responsibility (t(177) = 3.00; p = .003), ecological responsibility (t(177) = 3.61; p < .001) and altruistic-responsibility (t(177) = 3.56; p < .001) were in favour of female pre-service teachers. However, no difference was found between the pre-service teachers average scores in terms of the national responsibility dimension of the global social responsibility scale (t(177) = 1.13; p = .257). Considering these findings, it can be stated that both individual and global social responsibility levels of female pre-service teachers are higher than those of the male pre-service teachers.

**3. Findings about the 3rd Sub-Problem**

The third sub-problem of the study is stated with the question “Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers differ in terms of age variable?”. ANOVA analysis was conducted to find out the answer of this question. The findings obtained as a result of the analysis are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5. The Results of the One-Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) Conducted to Determine Whether Individual Social Responsibility and Global Social Responsibility Scale Scores Differentiate in terms of Age Variable**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **.**  **and**  **Values** | | | | | **ANOVA Results** | | | | | | |  |
| **Scale/Sub-Dimensions** | **Group** | n |  | ss | | **Var. K.** | **KT** | **sd** | **KO** | **F** | **p** | **Difference\*** |
| Individual Social Responsibility | 20 and under | 46 | 3.77 | .56 | | **Inter-group** | 1.42 | 2 | .71 | 2.41 | .093 | - |
| 21 | 50 | 3.57 | .54 | | **In-group** | 52.02 | 176 | .29 |
| 22 and over | 83 | 3.57 | .53 | | **Total** | 53.42 | 178 |  |
| Action-Oriented Responsibility | 20 and under | 46 | 3.96 | .55 | | **Inter-group** | 1.37 | 2 | .68 | 1.77 | .172 | - |
| 21 | 50 | 3.87 | .63 | | **In-group** | 67.91 | 176 | .38 |
| 22 and over | 83 | 3.75 | .64 | | **Total** | 69.28 | 178 |  |
| Ecological Responsibility | 20 and under | 46 | 4.04 | .74 | | **Inter-group** | 4.79 | 2 | 2.39 | 4.57 | .012 | 1 > 3 |
| 21 | 50 | 3.78 | .75 | | **In-group** | 92.32 | 176 | .52 |
| 22 and over | 83 | 3.64 | .69 | | **Total** | 97.12 | 178 |  |
| Altruistic-Responsibility | 20 and under | 46 | 3.84 | .68 | | **Inter-group** | 2.51 | 2 | 1.25 | 2.73 | .068 | - |
| 21 | 50 | 3.68 | .70 | | **In-group** | 80.89 | 176 | .46 |
| 22 and over | 83 | 3.55 | .65 | | **Total** | 83.41 | 178 |  |
| National Responsibility | 20 and under | 46 | 2.98 | .71 | | **Inter-group** | .13 | 2 | .06 | .17 | .840 | - |
| 21 | 50 | 2.93 | .54 | | **In-group** | 69.37 | 176 | .39 |
| 22 and over | 83 | 3.00 | .62 | | **Total** | 69.51 | 178 |  |
| Global Social Responsibility | 20 and under | 46 | 3.71 | .49 | | **Inter-group** | 1.46 | 2 | .73 | 2.93 | .056 | - |
| 21 | 50 | 3.57 | .51 | | **In-group** | 43.92 | 176 | .25 |
| 22 and over | 83 | 3.48 | .49 | | **Total** | 45.39 | 178 |  |

\*1: 20 and under, 2: 21, 3: 22 and over

It is revealed in Table 5 that there is no difference between the pre-service teachers’ average scores in terms of individual social responsibility scale (F(2, 176)= 2.41; p = .093) and global social responsibility scale (F(2, 176)= 2.93; p = .056) as a whole and the sub-dimensions of dimensions of action-oriented responsibility F (2, 176) = 1.77; p = .172), altruistic responsibility (F (2, 176) = 2.73; p = .068), and national responsibility (F (2, 176) = .17; p = .840). On the other hand, a statistically significant difference was found between the average scores of the pre-service teachers aged ‘20 and under’ and ‘22 and over’ taken from the ecological responsibility dimension of the Global Social Responsibility Scale. The difference was found to be in favour of the pre-service teachers aged 20 and under (F (2, 176) = .4.57; p = .012). In this regard, it can be stated that the age variable does not have an effect on the pre-service teachers’ perceptions about individual social responsibility and global social responsibility except for the ecological responsibility sub-dimension. However, it is seen that their perceptions about global social responsibility in terms of ecological responsibility become negative as they get older.

**Findings about the 4th Sub-Problem**

Independent Group t-Test analysis was conducted in order to find the answer to the fourth sub-problem of the study; “Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers differ in terms of having a foreign friend?”. The findings obtained from the analysis are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6. Independent Group t-Test Results to Determine Whether Individual Social Responsibility and Global Social Responsibility Scale Scores Differ in terms of Having a Foreign Friend Variable**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale/Sub-Dimensions** | **Groups** | n |  | ss | **shx** | **t Test** | | |
| **t** | **sd** | **p** |
| Individual Social Responsibility | Yes | 80 | 3,67 | ,60 | ,06 | 1.04 | 177 | .299 |
| No | 99 | 3,58 | ,49 | ,05 |
| Action-Oriented Responsibility | Yes | 80 | 3,85 | ,69 | ,07 | .33 | 177 | .739 |
| No | 99 | 3,82 | ,56 | ,05 |
| Ecological Responsibility | Yes | 80 | 3,80 | ,82 | ,09 | .27 | 177 | .783 |
| No | 99 | 3,77 | ,66 | ,06 |
| Altruistic-Responsibility | Yes | 80 | 3,70 | ,75 | ,08 | .59 | 177 | .554 |
| No | 99 | 3,64 | ,62 | ,06 |
| National Responsibility | Yes | 80 | 3,07 | ,68 | ,07 | 1.79 | 177 | .075 |
| No | 99 | 2,90 | ,56 | ,05 |
| Global Social Responsibility | Yes | 80 | 3,60 | ,58 | ,06 | .95 | 177 | .340 |
| No | 99 | 3,53 | ,43 | ,04 |

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that the pre-service teachers' average scores do not statistically differ in terms of the individual social responsibility (t (177) = 1.04; p = .299) and global social responsibility (t (177) = .95; p = .340) scales as a whole and the sub-dimensions action-oriented responsibility (t (177) = .33; p = .739), ecological responsibility (t (177) = .27; p = .783), altruistic responsibility (t (177) = .59; p <.554) and national responsibility (t (177) = 1.79; p <.075). In line with this finding, it can be asserted that the pre-service teachers' having or not having foreign friends do not statistically affect their individual and global individual social responsibility perceptions. However, the average scores of the pre-service teachers who have foreign friends are seen to be higher than those of the pre-service teachers who do not have foreign friends, which may indicate that having a foreign friend increases social responsibility perception.

**5. Findings about the 5th Sub-Problem**

The 5th sub-problem of the study is presented through the question “Do the individual and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers affect their perceptions about globalization?”. ANOVA analysis was conducted between to find out the relation between the average scores of pre-service teachers they took from the scales and their perceptions of globalization. The findings obtained from the analysis are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7. The Results of the One-Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) as to Whether Individual Social Responsibility and Global Social Responsibility Scale Scores Differ according to the Perception about the Interest in Globalization.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **.**  **ve**  **Values** | | | | | **ANOVA Results** | | | | | | |  |
| **Scale/Sub-Dimensions** | **Group** | n |  | ss | | **Var. K.** | **KT** | **sd** | **KO** | **F** | **p** | **Difference** |
| Individual Social Responsibility | Not interested | 18 | 3.52 | .44 | | **Inter-group** | .62 | 3 | .20 | .68 | .560 | - |
| Little interested | 35 | 3.53 | .48 | | **In-group** | 52.80 | 175 | .30 |
| Moderately interested | 84 | 3.65 | .58 | | **Total** | 53.42 | 178 |  |
| Much interested | 42 | 3.67 | .57 | |  |  |  |  |
| Action-Oriented Responsibility | Not interested | 18 | 3.57 | .64 | | **Inter-group** | 1.57 | 3 | .52 | 1.35 | .258 | - |
| Little interested | 35 | 3.80 | .70 | | **In-group** | 67.71 | 175 | .38 |
| Moderately interested | 84 | 3.87 | .61 | | **Total** | 69.28 | 178 |  |
| Much interested | 42 | 3.90 | .58 | | **Inter-group** |  |  |  |
| Ecological Responsibility | Not interested | 18 | 3.57 | .80 | | **In-group** | 1.70 | 3 | .56 | 1.04 | .375 | - |
| Little interested | 35 | 3.69 | .71 | | **Total** | 95.41 | 175 | .54 |
| Moderately interested | 84 | 3.87 | .74 | | **Inter-group** | 97.12 | 178 |  |
| Much interested | 42 | 3.78 | .72 | | **In-group** |  |  |  |
| Altruistic-Responsibility | Not interested | 18 | 3.45 | .65 | | **Total** | 2.09 | 3 | .69 | 1.50 | .216 | - |
| Little interested | 35 | 3.54 | .68 | | **Inter-group** | 81.32 | 175 | .46 |
| Moderately interested | 84 | 3.76 | .67 | | **In-group** | 83.41 | 178 |  |
| Much interested | 42 | 3.67 | .68 | | **Total** |  |  |  |
| National Responsibility | Not interested | 18 | 2.87 | .40 | | **Inter-group** | 1.54 | 3 | .51 | 1.32 | .268 | - |
| Little interested | 35 | 2.82 | .51 | | **In-group** | 67.97 | 175 | .38 |
| Moderately interested | 84 | 3.02 | .72 | | **Total** | 69.51 | 178 |  |
| Much interested | 42 | 3.05 | .64 | | **Inter-group** |  |  |  |
| Global Social Responsibility | Not interested | 18 | 3.36 | .40 | | **In-group** | 1.49 | 3 | .49 | 1.98 | .117 | - |
| Little interested | 35 | 3.46 | .48 | | **Total** | 43.89 | 175 | .25 |
| Moderately interested | 84 | 3.63 | .51 | | **Inter-group** | 45.39 | 178 |  |
| Much interested | 42 | 3.60 | .51 | |  |  |  |  |

The data in Table 7 show that the pre-service teachers' scores taken from individual social responsibility scale (F (3, 175) = 0.68; p = .560) and global social responsibility scale (F (3, 175) = 1.98; p = .117) as a whole, and action-oriented responsibility (F (3, 175) = 1.35; p = .258), ecological responsibility (F (3, 175) = 1.04; p = .375), altruistic responsibility (F (3, 175) = 1.50; p = .216) and national responsibility (F (3, 175) = 1.32; p = .268) do not significantly differ in terms of their interests in globalization-related issues. In line with this finding, it can be stated that pre-service teachers’ perceptions about both individual and global social responsibility do not change regardless of their levels of interest in globalization.

**Findings about the 6th Sub-Problem**

Simple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted to find out whether the individual social responsibility levels of pre-service teachers predict their levels of global social responsibility, which refers to the 6th sub-problem of the study. The findings obtained from the analysis are presented in Table 8.

**Table 8. Results of Simple Linear Regression Analysis regarding the Predictive Role of Primary School Pre-Service Teachers' Environmental Awareness Levels on Their Environmental Attitudes**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Dependent Variable** | **Independent Variable** | **β** | **Standard**  **Error** | **t** | **F** | **R** | **R2** | **p** |
| Individual Social Responsibility | Action-Oriented Responsibility | .42 | .05 | 7.33 | 53.86 | .48 | .23 | 000 |
| Ecological Responsibility | .52 | .03 | 13.35 | 178.32 | .70 | .50 | 000 |
| Altruistic Responsibility | .57 | .04 | 13.52 | 182.87 | .71 | .50 | 000 |
| National Responsibility | .31 | .06 | 5.12 | 26.29 | .36 | .12 | .000 |
| Global Social Responsibility | .82 | .15 | 15.61 | 243.72 | .76 | .57 | .000 |

According to the data in Table 8, it is seen that there is a positive and medium-level relation between individual social responsibility and the action oriented responsibility (R = .48; p <.001) sub-dimension of the global social responsibility scale. Also, the relations of pre-service teachers’ individual social responsibility levels (R = .76; p <.001) with their levels of ecological responsibility (R = .70; p <.001) and altruistic responsibility (R = .71; p <.001) sub-dimensions of global social responsibility scale are found to be positive and high-level while a positive but low-level relation is observed between their individual social responsibility levels and their levels of national responsibility sub-dimension of the global social responsibility scale (R = .36; p <.001). When it is examined to what extent the above-mentioned relations predict pre-service teachers’ individual social responsibility levels, it is found that the relations predict 57% of variance across global social responsibility (R2 = .57), 23% of variance in action-oriented responsibility dimension (R2 = .23), 50% of variance in ecological responsibility dimension (R2 = .50), 50% of the variance in the altruistic responsibility dimension (R2 = .50) and 12% of the variance in the national responsibility dimension (R2 = .12). Considering this finding, it can be asserted that individual social responsibility contributes to global social responsibility.

**Result**

According to the findings obtained from the study, it was determined that the individual social responsibility levels of pre-service teachers were high while their levels of global social responsibility were moderate. This finding shows that social studies pre-service teachers' individual and global social responsibility perceptions are developed. Also, a statistically significant difference was found in pre-service teachers’ individual and global social responsibility levels in favour of the female pre-service teachers. In line with this finding, it can be stated that female pre-service teachers have higher levels of social responsibility awareness both individually and globally compared to male pre-service teachers, which coincides with the findings of the researches conducted by Ercan (2009) and Secgin and Yazıcı (2018). However, the finding is in contradiction with the results of the research conducted by Başer (2015) on social studies pre-service teachers which showed that there was no significant difference in terms of gender variable.

No significant difference was found in social studies pre-service teachers’ individual and global social responsibility awareness levels in terms of the age variable. However; as for the ecological responsibility sub-dimension of the global social responsibility scale, a significant difference was found between the average scores of the social studies pre-service teachers aged 20 and under and aged 22 and over, and the difference was in favour of the female pre-service teachers. In the light of the findings, it can be stated that age does not affect the pre-service social studies teachers’ individual social responsibility perceptions and their global social responsibility perceptions except for the ecological responsibility sub-dimension of the global social responsibility scale. On the other hand, their perceptions about global social responsibility are found to become negative as they get older.

The findings reveal that social studies pre-service teachers' having or not having foreign friends do not statistically affect their individual and global individual social responsibility perceptions. However, when the averages are analysed, it is seen that both the individual and global social responsibility score averages of the pre-service teachers who have foreign friends are higher than those of the pre-service teachers who do not have foreign friends. This finding is thought to reveal that having a foreign friend increases the social studies pre-service teachers’ social responsibility awareness levels.

It is found that the individual social responsibility and global social responsibility levels of social studies pre-service teachers do not significantly affect their perceptions about globalization and do not make a statistically significant difference. In line with this finding, it can be asserted that pre-service teachers' perceptions of both individual and global social responsibility do not change regardless of their levels of interest in globalization.

Pre-service teachers' individual social responsibility levels are found to predict their global social responsibility levels. Based on this finding, it can be claimed that individual social responsibility contributes to global social responsibility. In today's education systems, individual and global social responsibility are among the basic values that should be brought to students. Because responsibility is an effective emotion for the individual to act in accordance with the rules, display forward-looking impeding behaviours and gain self-discipline by following their success orientation. While individuals with high sense of responsibility continue to work in discipline and attention with a focus on success, individuals with low sense of responsibility are individuals who are careless, disorganized and not eager to work (Costa and McCrae, 1995). Social responsibility also meets the individual's psychological and emotional needs (Kotler & Philip, 2006: 201). With this research, it can be stated that pre-service social studies teachers are aware of their individual and global social responsibilities and that they have internalized this situation.
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