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Abstract
The aim of this study is to develop a measurement tool that can determine the attitudes of social studies teachers and classroom teachers towards the use of current events in the social studies course. The scale consists of 23 five-point Likert-type items. The scale form consisting of 40 items prepared by the researchers was administered to a total of 394 teachers, including 303 classroom teachers and 91 social studies teachers working in different provinces of Turkey. As a result of the EFA, it was determined that the scale consists of 23 items and 2 sub-dimensions. The first sub-factor consisting of 14 items explains 40.44% of the variance of the related attitude variable, while the second sub-factor consisting of 9 items explains 12.99% of the variance of the related attitude variable. This two-factor structure explains 53.43% of the total variance. According to CFA analysis, values of χ2 / df = 2.73 (p = .000); RMSEA = 0.098; NFI = 0.90; CFI = 0.94; GFI = 0.77; NNFI = 0.97; and IFI = 0.94 were found. These findings reveal that the scale is a valid and reliable measurement tool to measure attitudes towards the use of current events in the social studies course. The original form of the scale is in Turkish.
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Introduction
Current events can be defined as “Events that arose some time ago, continue to affect people and are likely to be repeated at any time” (Demirkaya Gedik & Altun, 2015, p. 512). As can be understood from this definition, for an event to be regarded as a current event, it must continue to affect people. This effect may be either positive or negative. As social beings, humans can see the traces of these effects in their lives and can react according to these effects.

According to the National Council for Social Studies (NCSS, 1994), “The primary purpose of social studies is to help young people develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions for the public good as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world.” In order to achieve this main purpose, current events that help to establish a link between the past, present and future should be exploited. In terms of enabling the continuation of society, it is very important for individuals to efficiently analyse current events that affect a large part of that society, to make correct inferences and act accordingly, and to correctly adjust the direction of their attitudes.
and behaviours. In the social studies course, current events and their effects can be brought to the classroom as a course topic, and by enabling students to think actively, they can be used to achieve the aim to “develop the ability to make informed and reasoned decisions”, which is the main purpose stated by the NCSS. Moreover, the use of current events in the social studies course enables the acquisition of citizenship awareness, creates an environment for the examination of social events under the supervision of teachers, enables the adaptation of newly learned information to daily life, concretises the topics, and facilitates the teaching of 21st century skills such as lifelong learning and global awareness (Parker, 2018; Gedik, 2010; Eryılmaz & Çengelci Köse, 2017; Biser, 2008). Using current events in the social studies course can provide beneficial results in education by forming a bridge between school and real life. Considering that the social studies course is intertwined with current events, the use of current topics will contribute to students’ bonding with society (Demirkaya Gedik, 2008).

It is possible to discuss three approaches in the use of current events in the social studies course: using current events in addition to social studies, using current events to support or reinforce the social studies programme, and using current events to provide a basis for social studies course units (Parker, 2018, pp. 206-207). Whichever of these approaches is preferred, these courses are student-centred and the responsibility of learning belongs to the student, since students are active in the course processes (Arın & Deveci, 2008). In this respect, the use of current events enables unique learning experiences for students at all grade levels (Haas & Laughlin, 2000).

Following and analyzing current events with lessons planned by teachers who have been trained in the teaching of current events and know how to use these events in educational environments can contribute positively to the acquisition of high-level thinking skills of students (Öztürk, Yaylak & Zayimoğlu Öztürk, 2021). However, it is possible to encounter some problems in the use of current events. For example Deveci (2007) in his study in which he examined the views of teachers on using current events in teaching social studies lesson, stated that teachers experienced problems caused by students and their families during the use of current events in their lessons. In addition, the absence of standardized tests to be used in lessons and the fact that teachers do not have the necessary knowledge and equipment to use current events in lessons cause teachers to avoid using current events in their lessons (Swartz, 2019). In his study, Bozkurt (2017) concluded that some current events in social studies textbooks are out of date, narrow-scoped and difficult to understand, and insufficient in terms of attracting students’ attention. This situation can be seen as a reason for teachers who are inexperienced and not trained in current events and lesson planning to avoid using current events during their lessons.

Choosing controversial topics while choosing current events may cause difficulties for teachers in balancing the tension in the classroom. If the majority of people have different views and opinions on the subject and these opinions and thoughts contradict each other, these issues are called “controversial issues” (Memişoğlu, 2019). Although it is a difficult process to manage controversial issues in lessons, it can enable students to develop different perspectives and offer solutions for current issues and problems (Kan & Demirhan, 2019, p.101). However, teachers’ avoidance of discussion environments may result in their not wanting to use current events in the classroom environment and developing negative attitudes towards the use of current events in the classroom environment.

The views and attitudes of teachers, who make learning environments more effective and equipped, towards the content they will use in their lessons are important. The ideology of the environment in which individuals live, their communication with their environment, and the stimuli in their environment are very effective in the adoption or change of attitudes (Bakırçuoğlu, 2016, 1547).

When the literature is examined, it is possible to find different definitions of attitude. Allport (1935) defined an attitude as “a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related”. While Thurstone (1931) defined an attitude as “the affect for or against a psychological object”,
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Ajzen (1991) defined this behaviour as positive or negative evaluation, or the degree of evaluation.

While the definitions that were made focused on the affective component of attitude, Smith (1947) emphasized that emotions are affective and thoughts are cognitive, and for the first time put forward the claim that attitude consists of three components. Tavşancıl (2002) also suggested that attitude involves the hidden elements that have cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions existing in the individual towards an object. Inceoğlu (2011, pp. 22-23) defines attitude as “the predisposition for a mental, emotional and behavioural response that individuals organise based on their experience, knowledge, feelings and motives (motivation) against themselves or any object, social issue or event in their environment”.

According to the structural content of attitude, attitude is a one-dimensional variable, ranging from the most negative to the most positive, with three components: cognitive, affective and psychomotor (Erkuş, 2020, 76). For this reason, attitude scales should include positive and negative items that measure the cognitive, affective and psychomotor components. Although it is accepted in the literature that attitude consists of three components (Smith, 1947; Breckler, 1984; Middlebrook, 1974), discussions on this issue are still ongoing.

In the development of attitude scales, there are certain factors that need to be considered at the item-writing stage. Thurstone (1928) stated these factors as follows:

- Statements should be as short as possible so as not to tire the participant,
- Statements should be such that participants will endorse the attitude if they agree with it, or reject it if they disagree with it,
- Statements should be aimed at determining the reader’s attitude about the situation in question,
- Questions that ask two different questions at the same time but allow only one response (double-barrelled questions) should be avoided,
- It should be ensured that the majority of the statements belong to the attitude variable, which is the one intended to be measured.

While preparing the attitude scale towards the use of current events in the Social Studies course, the items were tried to be prepared by paying attention to the features emphasized in the literature. There are expressions that reflect the attitudes of teachers towards the behavior of using current events in the lesson.

The use of current events in lessons has increased in recent years. When the relevant literature is examined, it is seen that researches on the use of current events, experimental studies (Akkan, 2019; Akkan & Akhan, 2020; Akdağ, 2013; Arı & Deveci, 2018; Batti, 2016; Erdem, 2021; Eryılmaz & ÇengkapciKöse, 2017; Gürdoğan Bayır, 2010; Hass & Laughlin, 2000; Murray-Everett & Coffield, 2020; Tudball, 2005; Zemin, 2013), Action research (Bekret, 2019) views of teachers and pre-service teachers (Bozkurt, 2017; Deveci, 2007; Gedik, 2010); Gürkan, Kanatlı & Kumlu, 2020; Öztürk, Yaylak & Zaimoğlu (2021), scale development (Öcal, Demirkaya & Altınok, 2013), document reviews (Çelik & Yıldırım, 2021; Öztürk & Vezirğolu, 2021; Taşkın & Memişoğlu, 2019) and compilation studies (Kan & Demirhan, 2019; Paker, 2018; Sömen, 2020; Swartz, 2019). When the relevant literature is evaluated, the number of measurement tools for the use of current events in the social studies course is quite limited. Correct selection of current events in social studies course and good management of the process during in-class discussions is a difficult and important issue for teachers. For this reason, teachers’ attitudes towards using current events during classroom activities differ. In this study, a measurement tool was developed that can be used to determine the level of attitudes of classroom and social studies teachers towards using current events in social studies teaching. It is thought that the research will fill the gap caused by the lack of a scale for the purpose of the study in the literature and contribute to the field.

In this context, the aim of the research is to develop a measurement tool that can determine the attitudes of social studies teachers and classroom teachers towards the use of current events in social studies lessons. For this purpose, answers were sought for two sub-problems;

1. Does the attitude scale towards the use of current events in the social studies lesson reliably measure the attitudes of the teachers towards the
use of current events in the social studies lesson?
2. Does the attitude scale towards the use of current events in the social studies lesson validly measure the attitudes of the teachers towards the use of current events in the social studies lesson?

Method
This research is a scale development study. This part of the study includes the headings of the study group, the scale development process, data collection and data analysis.

Study Group
The study group of the research consists of social studies teachers and classroom teachers working in different provinces of Turkey. Convenience sampling method was used to determine the study group. In the appropriate sampling method, the group to be included in the research is determined on the basis of ease of access (Kothari, 2004). As of 2018, the number of classroom teachers working in the public sector is 216,854, while the number of social studies teachers is 30,182 (Gür, Çelik, Bozgeyikli&Yurdakul, 2018). For this reason, the number of classroom teachers whose data was collected in the study is more than the number of social studies teachers.

The descriptive statistics of the teachers participating in the research are presented in Table 1.

When Table 1 is examined, it is seen that 239 (60.7%) of the teachers participating in the research are female and 155 (30.3%) are male. 303 (76.9%) of the teachers participating in the study are classroom teachers and 91 (23.1%) are social studies teachers. As a result of the application, 394 people were reached; since the number of items is more than ten times and 200, it is assumed to be sufficient (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Scale Development Process
At the beginning of the scale development process, attitude and indicators including sub-dimensions about attitude were examined by examining the national and international literature. Of these, items based on Tavşancıl’s (2002) definitions and indicators were written. Information on the item writing is presented in Table 2.
field of social studies education, and 1 from the field of measurement and evaluation in education). The experts were asked to evaluate whether or not the scale measured attitudes towards the use of current events in the social studies course, and to evaluate situations such as language appropriateness and clarity of expression. The Lawshe technique was used in this. According to Lawshe (1975), content validity rates are obtained by collecting expert opinion for each item. Content validity ratios (CVR) are obtained by 1 minus the ratio of the number of experts expressing their “required” opinion on an item to half of the total number of experts expressing their opinion on the item. In this context, the content validity ratio (CVR) was calculated for the items in the scale. In line with the opinions of the experts, 10 items with a CVR ratio below .99 were removed from the scale, and the scale was finalized as 40 items by making changes in 5 items. A 5-point Likert-type evaluation criterion was used in the scale. (5: Strongly agree, 4: Agree, 3: Undecided, 2: Disagree, 1: Strongly Disagree).

**Data Collection**

In the study, two different ways of collecting data were followed: via face-to-face and online forms. By the end of this process, a total of 394 participants had been reached.

**Data Analysis**

After the data collection stage, a number of analyses were made on the data obtained from the 394 participants in order to ensure validity and reliability. First of all, items with negative statements were reversed. Then, the data extraction process was begun. During the data extraction process, Mahalanobis distances were calculated in order to identify outliers. 11 participants who were above the value in the chi-square table at the .01 significance level were excluded from the sample group.

In order to ensure the construct validity of the scale, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were performed. When the literature is examined, it is seen that there are different opinions about determining the sample size necessary to conduct EFA. Gorsuch (1983; cited in Bryman & Cramer, 2001, p. 263) recommended at least five participants per item and at least 100 per analysis. In order to carry out the analyses in line with this view, the sample group was randomly divided into two groups as 200 people in the first group and 183 people in the second group. EFA was performed on the first group, while CFA was conducted on the second group. Before performing EFA, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Bartlett’s test of sphericity were used to test the suitability of the data for factorisation. In addition, promax rotation was performed for EFA, while CFA was performed to test the data-model fit.

To test the reliability of the scale, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was calculated for the overall scale and for each sub-dimension. In order to test item validity, item-total correlation coefficients were calculated. In addition, in order to calculate the discriminatory power of the items, lower and upper 27% group comparisons were made. The SPSS 20.0 and LISREL 8.80 software packages were used for the validity and reliability analyses of the Attitude Scale for the Use of Current Events in the Social Studies Course.

**Findings and Discussion**

This section includes the findings obtained from the validity and reliability studies of the attitude scale developed for the use of current events in the social studies course.

**Findings Related to Validity**

**Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)**

In the literature, it is seen that there are different views about the size of the sample for which factor analysis is to be performed. It is stated that factor analysis performed on large sample groups yields more consistent results compared to that performed on small sample groups (MacCallum, Widaman, Zhang & Hong, 1999). Tinsley & Tinsley (1987) recommend a ratio of 5 to 10 individuals for each item. Comrey (1973), on the other hand, classified 100 samples as poor, 200 samples as fair, 300 samples as good, 500 samples as very good, and 1000 and above samples as excellent for factor analysis (as cited in Tinsley & Tinsley, 1987). In addition, Comrey (1988) stated that a sample group of 200 individuals was adequate for factor analysis.
in scales consisting of a maximum of 40 items. In this study, the scale form consisting of 40 items was applied to 200 people for the EFA. It can be said that this number meets the sample size requirement recommended in the literature.

Before the factor analysis was performed, the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) criterion and the Bartlett test were examined in order to test the suitability of the data for factor analysis and to determine whether or not the data showed a normal distribution. Regarding the data of this study, the KMO value was found to be .92 and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity value was determined as 4617.234 (p<.01). In social sciences, a KMO value greater than .60 indicates that the sample size is sufficient (Büyüköztürk, 2014). When the obtained data were examined, it was determined that the scale was suitable for factorisation. In the study, the promax rotation technique was used because it was thought that the factors were correlated with each other.

Kaiser (1960) stated that while determining the factors in EFA, factors with an eigenvalue of less than 1 should be excluded from the analysis. In addition, it is recommended that the item-factor loading should be at least .40 (DeVellis, 2014). In the analysis process, items that did not have a sufficient factor loading (<.40) and loaded on more than one factor (I1, I2, I3, I5, I6, I9, I10, I12, I14, I17, I18, I20, I25, I28, I29, I33, I37) were removed from the scale one by one and the analysis was repeated.

As a result of the EFA, a structure consisting of two factors with an eigenvalue of greater than 1 was obtained. Table 3 includes the distribution of items to factors, item-factor loadings and explained variances.

As can be seen in Table 3, the scale consisting of 23 items has a two-factor structure. By considering the item contents, these factors have been named as ‘positive attitude’ and ‘negative attitude’. The positive attitude dimension consists of 14 items and explains 40.44% of the total variance. The negative attitude dimension consists of 9 items and explains 12.99% of the total variance. This two-factor structure explains 53.43% of the total variance. Erkuş (2014) states that a total variance of 50% or more explained by the factors in exploratory factor analysis is an acceptable value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item No</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Attitude</td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I7</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I8</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I11</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I13</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I15</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I19</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I21</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I22</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I24</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I27</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I30</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I34</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I39</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td>I16</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I23</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I26</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I31</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I32</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I35</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I36</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Attitude</td>
<td>I38</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I40</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, in order to determine the relationships between the two factors in the scale, the correlation coefficients between the factors were calculated. The correlation coefficients showing the relationships between the factors are presented in Table 4 below.
When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that there is a moderate, significant negative correlation between the positive attitude and negative attitude factors (r=.47; p<.01).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA)**

Following the exploratory factor analysis, CFA was performed to examine the construct validity of the scale consisting of 23 items and two factors. In order to evaluate the fitness of a model in CFA, various goodness-of-fit indices are used.

Within the scope of this study, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), normed fit index (NFI), non-normed fit index (NNFI), comparative fit index (CFI), goodness-of-fit index (GFI), and incremental fit index (IFI) fit indices were examined, and in Table 5, the fit indices obtained as a result of the CFA are presented.

In Table 5, it can be seen that the values obtained as a result of the confirmatory factor analysis are within the appropriate ranges. However, the RMSEA value was found to be .098. Hu and Bentler (1999) state that this value should be less than .080. On the other hand, it has also been stated that the RMSEA value can be between 0.08 and 0.10 when the other fit index values are within the appropriate ranges (MacCallum, Browne & Sugawara, 1996). Moreover, the t-values examined to determine the significance of the parameter values for each item were found to range between 5.06 and 12.56 (p<.01).

When the fit index value of the data obtained from the scale is examined, it can be said that the model has a good fit to the data. The path diagram of the confirmatory factor analysis is presented in Figure 1 below.

In Figure 1 below, in the path diagram for the scale, it was determined that the chi-square degree was x²= 628.77, the degree of freedom was sd= 229, and the x²/sd ratio was 628.77/229= 2.74 (p < .05). A ratio below 5.0 indicates that the theoretical model has goodness of fit, and a value less than 3.0 indicates that the CFA model has a very good fit (Schermelleh-Engel, Moosbrugger, & Müller, 2003).

**Table 4 Correlation Coefficients between Positive Attitude and Negative Attitude Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive attitude</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative attitude</td>
<td>-.47*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01; n=200

**Table 5 Goodness-of-Fit Indices and References Obtained as a Result of CFA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodness of Fit</th>
<th>Obtained Value</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.08 ≤ x &lt; 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNFI</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0 ≤ x ≤ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0 ≤ x ≤ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFI</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>≥ 0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Criterion values for fit indices were adapted from Erkorkmaz et al. (2013).

**Findings Related to Reliability and Item Analysis**

Internal consistency analysis was carried out to determine the reliability of the scale. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was calculated for the whole scale and its sub-dimensions. In addition, item-total correlations were examined in order to determine whether or not each of the scale items measured the characteristic it was intended to measure. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients and item-total correlation values are presented in Table 6.
As shown in Table 6, the internal consistency coefficients were found to be .92 and .88 for the positive and negative attitude sub-dimensions of the scale, respectively, and .71 for the overall scale. It is stated that for a scale to be regarded as reliable, the reliability coefficient should be .70 and above (DeVellis, 2014). It can be said that the internal consistency coefficients calculated for the whole scale and its sub-dimensions are sufficient.

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that the item-total correlation values of the scale items range between .52 and .77 for the positive attitude sub-dimension and between .47 and .73 for the negative attitude sub-dimension. It is stated that the item-total correlation values should be .40 and above in order for an item to adequately measure the characteristic it is intended to measure (DeVellis, 2014). At this point, it can be said that the item-total correlation values of the items in the two-factor structure of the scale are sufficient for them to remain in the scale.

In order to determine whether or not each scale item discriminates between individuals who have and do not have the characteristic intended to be measured, t-test for independent groups was performed for the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the upper 27% (n=54) and lower 27% (n=54) groups determined according to their total scores. The t-values determined for the upper 27% and lower 27% groups are presented in Table 7.

### Table 6 Item-Total Correlations and Cronbach Alpha Internal Consistency Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Attitude</td>
<td>I4</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I16</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I7</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I23</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I8</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I26</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I11</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I31</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I13</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I32</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I15</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I35</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I19</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>I36</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I21</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I38</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I22</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I40</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I24</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I27</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I30</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I34</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I39</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Cronbach Alpha Value=.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7 T-Values for Upper 27% and Lower 27% Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>-5.669</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I7</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>-8.524</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I8</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>-9.880</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I11</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.351</td>
<td>-9.198</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When Table 7 is examined, it is seen that the t-values of the difference between the mean scores of the upper 27% and lower 27% groups range between -2.09 and -12.10 (p<.01). These findings reveal that each scale item is discriminatory at the desired level.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

In the study, a measurement tool was developed
to determine the attitudes of social studies teachers and classroom teachers towards the use of current events in the social studies course. As a result of the evaluations made by domain experts during the development of the scale, the validity and reliability of a scale form consisting of 40 items were tested. Following the exploratory factor analysis performed to test the construct validity of the scale, it was seen that it had a structure consisting of 23 items and two sub-factors. The scale consisting of these two sub-factors explains 53.43% of the total variance of the attitude variable. These sub-factors were named as “positive attitude” and “negative attitude” towards the use of current events, as explained by researchers in the literature. The positive attitude sub-factor consists of 14 items, while the negative attitude sub-factor consists of 9 items. The loading values for each sub-factor range from .48 to .88. As a result of the confirmatory factor analysis, it was concluded that the model has a good fit to the fit index values of the data obtained from the scale. When the reliability results of the scale were examined, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient was found to be .92 and .88 for the positive attitude and negative attitude sub-factors, respectively, while it was found to be .71 for the overall scale. It was concluded that the results of the reliability analysis are at an acceptable level. In the light of the findings obtained from this study, it can be stated that the scale presents a valid and reliable structure. Based on this point of view, it can be said that the scale can be used as a tool to determine the attitudes of social studies teachers and classroom teachers towards the use of current events in the social studies course.

There are numerous studies in the related literature on the use in classes of current events, which is one of the primary sources of nourishment in the social studies (Akkan, 2019; Akkan & Akhan, 2020; Akdaş, 2013; Arın & Deveci, 2018; Battı, 2016; Bozkurt, 2017; Çelik & Yıldırım, 2021; Deveci, 2007; Erdem, 2021; Eryılmaz & Çengele Köse, 2017; Gedik, 2010; Gürdoğan Bryar, 2010; Gürkan, Kanatlı & Kumlu, 2020; Hass & Laughlin, 2000; Kan & Demirhan, 2019; Murray-Everett & Coffield, 2020; Öcal, Demirkaya & Altnok, 2013; Öztürk & Veziroğlu, 2021; Öztürk, Yaylak & Zayimoğlu Öztürk, 2021; Paker, 2018; Sömen, 2020; Swartz, 2019; Taşkin & Memişoğlu, 2019; Tudball, 2005; Zemin, 2013). However, while the number of measurement tools for current events use is quite limited, no tool has been found to measure teachers’ attitudes towards current events use in social studies lessons. In this respect, it is thought that the developed measurement tool will contribute to the literature. This measurement tool was developed with the aim of determining the attitudes of social studies teachers and classroom teachers towards the use of current events in the social studies course. In the event that the scale is applied to different groups, it is recommended that the validity and reliability studies are renewed. Changing teachers’ attitudes towards using current events in lessons will increase the situation of including current events in lessons. It is thought that including current events in the lessons, understanding and evaluating them correctly will make the classroom environment more colorful, by building a bridge between school and real life, what has been learned will become more permanent and will contribute to the development of students as active citizens who are aware of social problems (Akkan and Akhan, 2008). 2020; Arın and Deveci, 2008; Binbaşoğlu, 2004; Gedik & Altun 2011; Kan and Demirhan, 2019) In this context, the Ministry of National Education may provide training on methods, techniques and teaching materials that can be used to benefit from current events in the classroom environment. In addition, it has been observed that studies on current events are generally concentrated in the field of Social Studies. Comparisons can be made by evaluating the use of current events in different courses.
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