
**EXAMINING THE INFLUENCE OF SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ON
SELECTED CIVIC OUTCOMES**

Abdinasir Hersi Jama and Dawood A. Y. AL-Hidabi
Kulliyah of Education, International Islamic University Malaysia

ABSTRACT

This paper sought to examine the different effects of selected background factors on several civic outcomes. To examine the relationship between these variables, the study compared the mean of the dependent variables with two or more groups of independent variables using an independent-sample t-test and a one-way ANOVA. In this regard, previous studies illuminated the effect of the background variables on students' civic outcomes. Nevertheless, these studies were mostly conducted in western communities. As such, it is important to note that, civic studies and the demographic effects in lesser developed countries, especially those that experienced social unrest and conflict, are minimal to non-existent. The present study was conducted in Somalia, which is considered to be the most violently divided country that has experienced the most prolonged state failure in the modern world. The civic outcomes for this study were measured using good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. At the same time, the background variables were gender, age, students' educational aspirations, and the parental level of education. Of the four independent variables, the study found that students' expected level of education was the only variable that demonstrated an influence on two civic results, namely, good citizenship and national identity. In contrast with the literature, a difference did not exist among the groups of other independent variables. Thus, this implies the impact of location on the results of the studies. In addition to this, it is worth noting that the limited variables of civic outcomes, as well as demographic variables, may have impacted the conclusions reached by the study. Therefore, further investigations are encouraged to reconcile these results with the literature.

Key Words: Civic outcomes, Parental education, civic participation, educational aspirations.

1. INTRODUCTION

An abundant number of studies have illuminated the effect of demographic variables on students' civic outcomes. However, these studies have mostly been conducted in western communities. As such, civic education studies and the demographic effects in lesser developed countries, especially those that have experienced social unrest and conflict, are minimal to non-existent. The present study was conducted in Somalia, which is considered to be the most violently divided country (Browne & Fisher, 2013) and one that has experienced the most prolonged state failure in the modern world (Abdullahi, 2017; Menkhaus, 2014). Elmi (2016) argues that in Somalia, an individual possesses more than one identity, that is, their clan, their national and their religious identity. However, a clan identity is given priority ahead of other identities. Hence, a Somali child grows in an environment where loyalty is given to a tribe or clan above

anything else. Consequently, for progressive civic development, Somali citizens need to possess five elements of citizenship values, as has been suggested by Cogan & Derricott (2014). Good citizens should; (i) have a feeling of identity (ii) have fundamental rights (iii) take commensurate obligations (iv) be ready to assume public roles (v) respect the essential values of the society.

According to Elmi (2016), the development of a good Somali citizen is confronted with three critical impediments. Firstly, since the state and citizenship are mutually inclusive, there is no agreed Somali state, as there are clan-based competing regions; each independent of the central government. Therefore, due to the absence of a national state, there are no citizens. Secondly, role ambiguity exists between the nation and the clans. This situation makes the country a state of gathered clans that lacks a national identity and feeling. Thirdly, there is no sense of obligation towards the nation. Instead, the people of Somalia have an expectation that the country should provide benefits to them only. The benefit is not a mutual benefit with rights and corresponding obligations. Thus, this phenomenon results in a need to investigate the factors that might impact the civic outcomes of Somali students in their last year of schooling. Specifically, the study will explore the influence of demographic variables on the civic outcomes of citizenship, national identity and civic participation.

1.1 Why is a civic education necessary?

In the last several decades, the world has experienced significant transformational changes and challenges to societies. These transformations are, in part, attributable to technological advancements that cross borders without any barriers. Indeed, the world has become somewhat similar to a small village. Consequently, globalization changes people's way of life, alters how things are perceived, and the ways people acquire knowledge and the ease of access to information (Cogan & Derricott, 2014; Keser, Akar, & Yildirim, 2011). Similarly, Nik Rosila (2013) added that modern advancements and inventions in technology placed significant pressure on human method of interaction and hence altered the relationship and connections between them.

Furthermore, societies in the world face clear implications of cultural, political, and knowledge assimilation to live as a cosmopolitan village. Therefore, the interest of nations in citizenship education and the development of its values among citizens has increasingly been emphasized to cope with growing violence, the disintegration of social relations, conflicts of interests, to strengthen the value system and rules of ethical conduct in the society (محمد, 2016). Consequently, educational reforms have been conducted in many places in the world as a response to these dramatic changes (Gearon, 2015). The reason for this is, if students are not exposed to civic education and are not taught about their governments, as they advance through the education system, the chance for education to create skilful and mindful graduates and the minimization of students' common estrangements relating to public issues cannot be resolved (Quigley, 1995). In addition, civic instructions enable students to gain tools and aptitudes that will make them become reliable citizens in their lives (Bischoff, 2016).

Citizenship development for younger generations and how civic education can contribute to this phenomenon has been underdiscussion in societies in the world and among researchers too. Many jurisdictions have enacted it as an obligatory course in their school curriculum (Geboers, Geijssel, Admiraal, & ten Dam, 2013). Thus, schools are not supposed to only teach state affairs, civic participation, tolerance, and administration; they are also entrusted to provide students with chances to contribute in decisions of their communities for better future involvement (Torney-Purta & Barber, 2005). Furthermore, this kind of education develops the virtues, skills, and habits of mind that enable the current political structure to continue, as well as to improve (Ben-porath, 2012).

Seemingly, nations devote tremendous efforts to the younger generation's knowledge about their country and also help them to form positive attitudes of being good citizens. Thus, civic education becomes indispensable for every society, as every society requires citizens who can take part in the current and future development of the nation in all aspects and levels (Eid, 2015; Mouritsen & Jaeger, 2018). This argument is consistent with the works of J. Cogan & Derricott (2014), who argue that today's governments rely on the successful implementation of citizenship education.

Furthermore, the severe conflicts of interest among nations and within the same society, increased anti-social activities, technological advancements, and state failures, necessitate the teaching of civic and citizenship education (Oluniyi, 2011). As a result, civic education has escalated worldwide in the last decade. Having said that, the reasons behind this increased interest differs with different nations (Evans & Url, 2011; García-Cabrero, Sandoval-Hernández, Treviño-Villareal, Ferráns, & Martínez, 2017). Indeed, it can be seen in the literature that teachers, policymakers, and researchers have attempted to understand and assess the complex process by which young people learn about citizenship.

Civic education rests in the heart of the world's education systems and "everywhere one turns, be it Asia, Europe, Latin America and even parts of Africa, there is a renewed emphasis on civic and citizenship education, as a part of the formal school curriculum" (Cogan & Derricott, 2014, p. xiv). The above literature on civic and citizenship education (CCE) confirms its importance and the role it plays in the quest to build future generations. Furthermore, we can deduce that almost all nations in the world strategize to produce active, participative, and responsible citizens to become the catalyst for every aspect of human development. The present paper sought to assess the different effects that age, gender, students' expected level of education, and parental level of education has on the civic outcomes of good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. The research is guided by the following question:

1. Is there a significant difference between students' perceptions of good citizenship, national identity and civic participation with their age, gender, expected level of education and parental education?

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Previous studies have confirmed the effect of students' social background on their civic development. Torney-Purta et al. (2001) found that students from low education level families demonstrated less civic knowledge compared to those from knowledgeable families. In addition, parents who attained a certain level of education are in a better position to impact the curriculum activities related to civic education of their children to develop their public knowledge and participation in community affairs (Bischoff, 2016).

Similarly, the literature has revealed that the civic development process results from the influence and interaction of the child with the outside environment that surrounds him or her (Keating & Janmaat, 2015; Wolfram Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010b; Zaff, Malanchuk, & Eccles, 2008). Consequently, family, schools (curriculum, classroom climate, and the ethos), peer groups, and neighbours shape a child's citizenship (Rossi, Lenzi, Sharkey, Vieno, & Santinello, 2016; Wolfram Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, & Agrusti, 2016a). A number of studies have indicated that gender, parental education, students' expected level of education, the media, the number of books at home, the interest in politics, social issues by the students and his or her parents, all influence a student's civic development (Dee, 2004; Keating & Janmaat, 2015; Kim, 2013; McIntosh, Hart, & Youniss, 2007; Treviño, Béjares, Villalobos, & Naranjo, 2017; Wilkenfeld & Torney-Purta, 2012).

Other studies confirmed the influence of the media on students' civic development process as it contributes, among other factors, into the socializing agents of students into their social issues. In this regard, Bobkowski & Miller (2016); Kim, (2013) and Moeller, Kühne, & De Vreese (2018) argued that students who regularly watched or listened to the media to inform themselves about political and social issues of the country were more likely to participate in their communities. Similarly, studies by Geboers, Geijsel, Admiraal, & ten Dam (2013) indicated that schools instilled a sense of belongingness and identity in the students. However, this is dependent on a teacher's instructional methods and the school context, such as the school ethos, school safety, and school composition of different social status and groups (Gregory & Miyazaki, 2018; Treviño et al., 2017).

The above arguments are in line with the ecological systems theory (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Neal & Neal, 2013). The theory states that the search for identity in adolescents starts in the early stages of their lives. The inside and outside factors influence them, and thereby, the adolescents develop a particular appreciation of their culture (Zaff et al., 2008). Similarly, various studies found that civic and citizenship education is affected not only by school factors such as the classroom instructions and other school activities occurring at school. Instead, the process is impacted by other factors taking place in the surrounding environment of the students, such as their interactions with broader communities (Wolfram Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, & Agrusti, 2016b). In the same vein, Keating & Kerr (2013) asserted that civic education involves three inter-related areas, namely; the taught/formal curriculum; the school culture and ethos; and the wider community.

Studies by Dunst, Hamby, Trivette, Raab, & Bruder (2000, p. 151) demonstrate that the learning process is influenced by many significant factors available at different levels within a family, school, and community. These factors provide students with "development-enhancing

learning opportunities."Carretero et al. (2016, p. 295) also asserted that "learning results not only from formal teaching of information, but also from individuals' interaction, dialogue, and performance of action within their social context."Moreover, students' access to community discussion forums and community information sharing avenues help them to develop a sense of belongingness and identity and acknowledge a community'sinterdependence with one another.Thus, a collective attitude and togetherness will replace individualistic attitudes (Berezowitz, Pykett, Faust, & Flanagan, 2016; Brennan, 2017). Therefore, Dharma, Sapriya, Winataputra, & Komalasari (2018) suggested that civic education programs should be tailored to the needs of the community and be reflective of current conditions for prospective participants. During this process, the interdependence of the world's communities and the impact of globalization on contemporary societies should be kept in mind (Berezowitz et al., 2016).

Zaff et al. (2008) and Zaff & Michelsen (2002) note that adult students have a huge potential to help improve their communities. They can make their families, neighbours, schools, and communities great places by contributing to civic organizations, becoming socially responsible, and participating in social programs. In this regard, Martin & Chiodo (2007) concluded that the age of students influences citizenship practices. Between the ages of 13-16, students translate citizenship practices into action. These activities will have more relevance and meaningful impact when they grow older, have a family, pay tax, and get involved in real-life contexts. These practices not only benefit political and community interests, but also, an increasing number of employers still consider them as necessary employee skills. Consequently, businessmen argue that solely technical expertiseis not enough to succeed without civic and social skills (Wolfram Schulz et al., 2016a).

Furthermore, a review of the related literature reveals that the school age is assumed to be the most appropriate time and place in which a child's civic identity develops. The learning opportunities, achild's interaction with a school community and the participation in school activities all contribute to the proper development of a civic identity (Geboers et al., 2013; Thoits & Hewitt, 2001; Zaff et al., 2008; Zaff, Malanchuk, Michelsen, & Eccles, 2003). Hence, educational institutions are supposed to equip learners with five crucial qualities of identity, namely; determination, to uphold respect of others, accountability, national identity, and devotion to the community (Au & Kennedy, 2017).Zaff et al. (2008)added that civic programs at an early stage should be given additional attention while developing and presenting it to the child for proper growth. This experience accumulates through the life of the child, which will impact his or her commitment to the community he or she belongs to (Johnson, 2017; Zaff et al., 2008, 2003).

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Civic and citizenship education as a new research area tends to be underdeveloped and lacks well-tested theories; hence, scholars take different perspectives while studying the civic phenomena. In this regard, Bischoff (2016) points that the empirical research and theories on the roles that schools have on students' civic outcomesare minimal, thus instigating theories is one of the priorities in the field but testing them has its difficulties. Consequently, the inadequacy of the theories in the field, which would help researchers to generate hypotheses, can create a problem

for researchers (Wilkenfeld, Lauckhardt, & Torney-Purta, 2010). Also, the authors noted despite the enormous interest among researchers and policymakers in the field, the lack of a theoretical basis for which to base on their research questions and measurement tools makes the situation difficult to produce results applicable to practical life.

Consequently, researchers in the field usually employ different models and theories to develop the theoretical framework of their studies. This is reasonable, since the field encompasses different disciplines such as education, psychology, political science, and sociology. Having said that, drawing from the theories of these disciplines is challenging and essential in order to come up with guiding assumptions of one's study (Torney-Purta, Amadeo, & Andolina, 2010). As such, the three primary and widely referred theories by researchers in this area are; the ecological systems theory by Bronfenbrenner (1992), the situated learning theory by Lave & Wenger (1991), and the social cognitive theory by Bandura (1986).

The ecological systems theory claims that human development continually changes and is affected by the surrounding environment. However, due to its simplicity and ambiguity, the situated learning model has been adopted by many researchers. This model emphasizes a more in-depth comprehension of interrelated elements of school environment which an individual student is exposed to. The social cognitive theory described by Au & Kennedy (2017, p. 2) is an "individual's perception as reflected through self-efficacy in relation to the engagement processes in school activities and one's expectations toward future civic engagement."

Other researchers in the field consider human development models to be fundamental tenets for civic education. Thus, theories such as the social learning theory, the cognitive model, the active model, and the cultural model of development all have influences on the concepts and views of civic and citizenship education (Carretero et al., 2016). Lin (2015) asserted that these theories can be suitably beneficial in explaining the students' development and advancements from the schooling period and until they actively participate in social affairs when they grow up.

3. METHODS

Sample and Procedure

A total of 400 participants who were Form Four students at the secondary school completed the questionnaire. All the questionnaires were received and filled in properly. The study employed quantitative research methodologies to compare the students' civic outcomes with the demographic variables. The aim of the present study was to examine the effects of selected demographic variables on the results of selected civic variables. As such, a cross-sectional sample survey design was utilized. In cross-sectional surveys, the data collection is conducted at one point in time using one population of the same variables. In this design, the research population was chosen based on specific characteristics dictated by the research objectives in which the researcher studies the causes and results (Setia, 2016). In cross-sectional research design, it is possible to evaluate the overall outcomes of a target population since it uses a representative sample of the whole population under investigation. Similarly, it enables a

researcher to assess several issues at one point in time in a relatively inexpensive way within a short period (Hemed & Tanzania, 2015).

Measures

Ong (2012) proposed three procedures that researchers can employ when they are designing research instruments, namely; (i) using the same tools used for other studies (adoption), (ii) using the same instruments but with some modifications to suit the specific needs of the survey (adaption) and lastly, (iii) developing new devices (development). Accordingly, the present paper utilized amalgamated measurements derived from the literature after a thorough review conducted by the researcher (Brese, Jung, Mirazchiyski, Schulz, & Zuehlke, 2011; W Schulz & Sibberns, 2004), as well as self-developed measures by the researcher. The questionnaire development is always dictated by the methodology chosen by the researcher, the mode of data collection, and the sampling frame (Schnall, Wolkin, & Nakata, 2018). This kind of process requires the researcher to conduct a thorough review of the current literature and be very familiar with the constructs. Additionally, a six-point Likert scale was used to assess the constructs investigated. To increase the participants' understanding level of the questionnaire, the English designed instruments were translated into the Somali language.

Data Analysis

The IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) Version 26 was used for the data analysis. The mean, standard deviation, and 95% confidence interval were used. In addition, a normality assessment was performed. Thus, the normality of this study has been determined using skewness and kurtosis. According to Schmider, Ziegler, Danay, Beyer, & Bühner (2010), a value of skewness and kurtosis in the range of $[-2.0]$ and $[9.0]$ respectively, is considered to be acceptable. When researchers intend to examine the relationships between variables, they can compare the mean of the dependent variables with two or more groups of independent variables (Venkatesh, Brown, & Bala, 2013). Moreover, while analysing the quantitative data in this way, the process always consists of two stages, namely, the descriptive analysis and the hypothesis testing with the ANOVA or an independent-sample *t*-test. Thus, the researcher followed this process to analyse the data. However, the main difference between the ANOVA and *t*-test is that a *t*-test can only be used for variables of two groups. Yet, with an ANOVA, the researcher can compare variables with more than two groups. Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to test the internal consistency of the questionnaire items. According to Leech, Barrett, & Morgan (2014), a value Cronbach's Alpha of .60-.69 is a good indication of internal consistency. Thus, the results of all constructs were in the acceptable range (.69 for good citizenship, .62 for national identity, and .77 for civic participation). Before the statistical analysis was run, outliers were checked and removed, if any were found. Similarly, a *p*-value of 0.05 was set as the statistical significance level.

4. RESULTS

The present study aimed to see whether there were significant differences in students' civic outcomes between four demographic variables. The statistical analysis associated with students' civic outcomes across the genders is reported in **Table 1**. An independent-samples t-test was performed to compare the good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation of the gender groups. The results illustrated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the boys and the girls in the above civic outcomes. As shown in the table below, the mean of the male students ($M=60.22$, $SD=8.60$) did not significantly differ from the female students ($M=59.36$, $SD=7.74$); $t(398)=1.02$, $p=0.31$ for the good citizenship civic outcome. Similarly, as for the national identity civic outcome, the mean of the male students ($M=56.92$, $SD=8.11$) did not significantly differ from the female students ($M=56.27$, $SD=7.91$), $t(398)=0.80$, $p=0.42$. In the civic participation civic outcome, the mean of the male students ($M=30.64$, $SD=7.70$) did not significantly differ from the female students ($M=30.93$, $SD=7.45$), $t(398)=-0.38$, $p=0.71$.

Table 1. Statistical analysis associated with students' civic outcomes across gender.

	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Good citizenship	Boys	237	60.22	8.6	1.02	398	0.31
	Girls	163	59.36	7.74			
National identity	Boys	237	56.92	8.11	.80	398	0.42
	Girls	163	56.27	7.91			
Civic participation	Boys	237	30.64	7.70	-0.377	398	-0.38
	Girls	163	30.93	7.45			

In order to test the hypothesis that students' age had an effect on students' civic outcomes, a between-group ANOVA was performed. Prior to conducting the ANOVA, the assumption of normality was checked and was determined to be satisfied, as the age groups' distributions were associated with a skew and kurtosis less than $|2.0|$ and $|9.0|$ respectively (Schmider et al., 2010), see Table 2. Furthermore, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was tested and satisfied based on Levene's $F(4, 395) = 2.03$, $p=.089$. Table 2 shows the statistical analysis of the students' civic outcomes across the age groups. A one-way ANOVA was conducted to compare the effect of age groups on the students' civic outcomes, such as good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. It was found that the age group did not have a significant impact on the students' civic outcomes, such as the good citizenship $F(4, 395)=0.99$, $p<.41$, the national

identity $F(4, 395)=1.70, p<.0.15$, and the civic participation of the students $F(4, 395)=1.60, p<0.17$.

Table 2. Statistical analysis for students' civic outcomes across the age groups

Age group		N	M	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Df	F	Sig.
Good citizenship	Below 14	6	63.66	2.80	.76	-.78	(4, 395)	.99	.41
	15-19	295	59.70	8.0	-.19	-.03			
	20-24	95	60.24	9.18	-.24	-.06			
	24-29	2	52.50	13.44	-	-			
	Above 30	2	65.00	14.14	-	-			
National identity	Below 14	6	59.5	3.45	1.64	3.37	(4, 395)	1.70	0.15
	15-19	295	56.45	8.20	-.97	4.80			
	20-24	95	57.39	7.50	-.09	2.05			
	24-29	2	56.50	2.12	-	-			
	Above 30	2	44.00	12.73	-	-			
Civic participation	Below 14	6	37.33	5.47	-1.72	3.25	(4, 395)	1.60	0.17
	15-19	295	30.54	7.44	-.48	-.28			
	20-24	95	30.98	8.03	-.48	-.51			
	24-29	2	36.50	7.78	-	-			
	Above 30	2	27.50	6.36	-	-			

Similarly, ANOVA analysis was conducted to compare the effect of students' expected level of education on civic outcomes, including good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. Table 3 shows the statistical analysis associated with students' civic outcomes across the groups of students' expected level of education. This is done before the ANOVA to check the assumption of normality, which is always determined using skew and kurtosis. To test the hypothesis of the groups, a one-way ANOVA was performed. Consequently, the results illustrated a statistically significant difference among the four levels in their effect of both good citizenship $F(3, 396)=2.86, p<.05$, and national identity $F(3, 396)=3.30, p<.05$. Thus, the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected. To evaluate the nature of the difference between the four means further, the statistically significant ANOVA was followed up with three Fisher's LSD post-hoc tests (Hayter, 1986). The results showed that the secondary level was much lower than the other three levels of the expected level of students. On the other hand, it was found that the expected level of education did not have a significant impact on the students' civic outcomes of the civic participation $F(3, 396)=2.33, p<.07$. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 3. Statistical analysis for students' civic outcomes across the groups for expected level of education

The expected level of education	N	M	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Df	F	Sig.	
Good citizenship	Secondary	14	62.79	7.32	1.32	1.14	(3, 396)	2.86	.05
	Bachelor's degree	2	47.50	6.36	-	-			
	Master	53	58.26	7.88	.14	-.50			
	Ph.D.	331	60.09	8.29	-.30	.12			
National identity	Secondary	14	58.14	10.72	.73	.02	(3, 396)	3.30	.05
	Bachelor's degree	2	41.50	10.60	-	-			
	Master	53	55.19	7.49	-1.18	3.27			
	Ph.D.	331	56.50	7.89	-.94	5.13			
Civic participation	Secondary	14	31.00	9.99	-.77	-.66	(3, 396)	2.33	.07
	Bachelor's degree	2	22.50	9.19	-	-			
	Master	53	31.12	7.92	.01	-1.08			
	Ph.D.	331	36.50	7.37	-.55	-.09			

Table 4 shows the statistical analysis of mothers' level of education (parents) on the civic outcomes of good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. In this table, the assumption of normality, as determined skewness and kurtosis is shown. Additionally, a one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the influences of mothers' level of education (parents) on the civic outcomes of good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. The result demonstrated that there was no statistical significant difference in the students' civic outcomes, such as good citizenship $F(5, 394)=1.33, p<.25$, national identity $F(5, 394)=.90, p<.48$, and the expected civic participation of the students $F(5, 394)=.21, p<.96$.

Table 4. Statistical analysis for students' civic outcomes across the parental education (mother) group

Parental of education (mother)	N	M	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Df	F	Sig.	
Good citizenship	Not finished elementary	88	60.24	7.64	-.11	-.22	(5, 394)	1.33	.25
	Finished	58	59.33	8.65	-.05	.18			

	elementary								
	Finished secondary	105	58.44	8.54	-.42	-.16			
	Diploma	22	62.00	6.43	.07	-.55			
	University Degree	52	61.17	7.77	-.33	.59			
	I don't know	75	60.37	8.94	.03	-.09			
National identity	Not finished elementary	88	56.28	9.34	-1.16	5.67	(5, 394)	.90	.48
	Finished elementary	58	55.76	8.70	-1.16	4.70			
	Finished secondary	105	56.97	7.78	-.67	2.23			
	Diploma	22	55.09	9.00	-1.28	2.17			
	University Degree	52	56.23	5.87	-1.54	3.30			
	I don't know	75	58.11	7.12	1.02	1.38			
Civic participation	Not finished elementary	88	30.74	8.09	-.61	-.06	(5, 394)	.21	.96
	Finished elementary	58	31.36	7.51	-.60	-.26			
	Finished secondary	105	30.68	7.35	-.20	-1.04			
	Diploma	22	29.68	8.60	-.36	-.61			
	University Degree	52	30.37	7.52	-.42	-.44			
	I don't know	75	31.03	7.29	-.71	.52			

Similarly, in Table 5, the descriptive and inferential statistics for civic outcomes across six levels offathers' education are shown. In addition to the mean (M), andstandard deviation (SD), the skewness and kurtosis for normality assumption isdisplayed in the table.A one-way ANOVA was performed to compare the effects of father' education (parents) on the civic outcomes of good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. The result depicted that there was nota statistically significant impact on the students' civic outcomes, such as good citizenship attitudes $F(5, 394)=.19, p<.97$, the national identity $F(5, 394)=.90, p<.48$, and the expected civic participation of the students $F(5, 394)=.58, p<.71$.

Table 5: Statistical analysis for students' civic outcomes across the parental education (father) group

Parental of education (father)		N	M	SD	Skew	Kurtosis	Df	F	Sig.
Good citizenship	Not finished elementary	88	60.60	8.69	-.26	-.53	(5, 394)	.19	.97
	Finished elementary	58	60.04	8.56	-.30	-.20			
	Finished secondary	105	60.02	7.60	-.10	1.30			
	Diploma	22	60.06	8.22	-.16	-.10			
	University Degree	52	59.34	7.74	-.02	-.31			
	I don't know	75	60.01	9.33	-.45	.35			
National identity	Not finished elementary	88	56.78	9.31	-2.37	10.37	(5, 394)	.90	.48
	Finished elementary	58	58.20	7.76	-.11	1.08			
	Finished secondary	105	58.01	7.78	-.73	5.00			
	Diploma	22	55.42	8.67	-2.35	7.32			
	University Degree	52	55.70	7.62	-.19	1.73			
	I don't know	75	56.92	7.71	.04	1.47			
Civic participation	Not finished elementary	88	30.74	8.09	-.61	-.06	(5, 394)	.58	.71
	Finished elementary	58	31.36	7.51	-.60	-.26			
	Finished secondary	105	30.68	7.35	-.20	-1.04			
	Diploma	22	29.68	8.60	-.36	-.61			
	University Degree	52	30.37	7.52	-.42	-.44			
	I don't know	75	31.03	7.29	-.71	.52			

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study aimed to examine whether a statistically significant difference exists in civic outcomes among Form Four students in terms of the selected demographic variables. The civic outcomes for this study were measured using good citizenship, national identity and civic participation, while the demographic variables were gender, age, students' educational aspirations, and the parents' level of education. The study used an independent-sample t-test as

well as a one-way ANOVA, to test the hypothesis that theselected demographic variables affected the selected civic outcomes of the study. The results showed that most findings were not in line with the current literature. However, it is worth noting that the limited variables of civic outcomes, as well as the demographic variables, may have impacted the conclusions reached by the study. The study may have also beenimpacted by the location of the study, as literature in this field is usually conducted in western societies.

The results of this study demonstrated that gender does not have an effect on civic outcomes. Specifically, the results suggested that males and females have the same good citizenship, national identity, and civic participation. However, studies by Hart & Wandeler (2018), Knowles et al. (2018), and Taylor et al. (2019)confirmedthe impact of genderon civic outcomes such as support of human rights, social justice, political efficacy, interest in volunteerism and civic activities preferred by female and male students. Additionally, Wolfram Schulz et al. (2010a) suggested that gender, family background, political orientations, and socioeconomic backgrounds, influence astudents' civic outcome. Similarly, Cicognani, Zani, Fournier, Gavray, & Born (2012), Flanagan, Bowes, Jonsson, Csapo, & Sheblanova, (1998) and Zaff et al., (2008)stated that female students are more likely to participate in their communities compared to their male student counterparts.

Furthermore, the study found that the age group does not affect any of the civic outcomes. Meaning to say, students possess the same civic inclination at all age levels. Yet, the current literature does not supportthese results. According toMartin & Chiodo (2007), citizenship practices are influenced by the age of students. Between the ages 13-16, students translate citizenship practices into action. Moreover, these activities become more important and meaningful when they grow older, have a family, pay tax, and become involved in real-life contexts.

In line with the current literature, our results concluded thatstudents' expected level of education had an effect on two of the three selected civic outcomes, namely, good citizenship and national identity. The finding is supported by the literature that foundstudents' expected level of education had significant influences on their civic development (Dee, 2004; Keating & Janmaat, 2015; Kim, 2013; McIntosh et al., 2007; Treviño et al., 2017; Wilkenfeld & Torney-Purta, 2012). The authors argue that the higher the expected level of education, the better the civic outcome of the students. In this study, thesecondary school level was accounted much lower than the other higher degrees.However, contrary to the above literature, the expected levels of education did not have a statistically significantdifference in the outcomes of civic participation. This invites further investigation to compile these findings with the literature.

The results of the study depicted that there was no statistically significant difference that existed among themother's level of education. Similarly, there was no significant difference between the father's level of education. As such, this shows that students' civic outcomes don't change as the level of parental education changes. These results contradicts the research of Taylor et al. (2019) and Zaff et al. (2008) which found that parental education has a positive influence on students' civic participation.

6. CONCLUSION

The present study concluded that males and females possess similar civic results of good citizenship, national identity and civic participation. It was also found that these civic outcomes change with the change in students' educational aspirations. Conversely, no difference in the outcomes takes place as a result of the change in parental level of education. The results generated by this study pointed to the different conclusions compared with studies conducted in different locations of the world. Thus, this implies the impact of the site on the results of the studies.

Nevertheless, students' expected level of education was the only independent variable that has been shown to influence two of the three selected civic results, namely, good citizenship and national identity. The main finding of the present study is the need to conduct further investigations in the civic education field. Furthermore, the study encourages the creation of a research culture among the secondary school students who are due to graduate, who showed hesitation and less enthusiasm to participate in the study. As the secondary students are joining a higher education level, they are supposed to be prepared to take part in more sophisticated studies.

Limitations

There were several limitations to the study. In Somalia, it is uncommon for school students to participate in research. As such, this was the first time they were involved in research like this. Moreover, the participants' experiences with other studies may have had an influence on the study outcomes. Consequently, this might have impacted the studies, unless the researcher carefully administered the data collection process.

Additionally, the study applied an independent-samples t-test and one-way ANOVA only on the data collected. Other inferential statistics may have provided different results. Despite that, the study provided results that have challenged several literature results that have been taken granted thus far. Also, the English language deficiency among the target population required the researcher to devote more time and resources for the translation and to check the validity and reliability of the instruments through the involvement of experts.

REFERENCE:

Abdullahi, A. (2017). Somalia: Reconfiguration of National Identity. In *State Building and National Identity Reconstruction in the Horn of Africa* (pp. 121–143). Springer.

Au, W. C. C., & Kennedy, K. J. (2017). An assessment of the role of Hong Kong schools in promoting civic learning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 37(2), 248–261.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ*, 1986.

Ben-porath, S. (2012). Citizenship As Shared Fate: Education for Membership. *Educational Theory*, 62(4), 381–395.

- Berezowitz, C., Pykett, A., Faust, V., & Flanagan, C. (2016). Well-being and civic outcomes. *Research on Student Civic Outcomes in Service Learning: Conceptual Frameworks and Methods*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Bischoff, K. (2016). The civic effects of schools: Theory and empirics. *Theory and Research in Education*, 14(1), 91–106.
- Bobkowski, P. S., & Miller, P. R. (2016). Civic implications of secondary school journalism: Associations with voting propensity and community volunteering. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 93(3), 530–550.
- Brennan, J. (2017). ESSA: Mapping Opportunities for Civic Education. Education Trends. *Education Commission of the States*.
- Brese, F., Jung, M., Mirazchiyski, P., Schulz, W., & Zuehlke, O. (2011). *ICCS 2009 User Guide for the International Database. Supplement 3: Variables Derived from the Survey Data*. ERIC.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). *Ecological systems theory*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development*. Sage.
- Browne, E., & Fisher, J. (2013). Key actors mapping: Somalia. *Birmingham: GSDRC, University of Birmingham*.
- Carretero, M., Haste, H., & Bermudez, A. (2016). Civic education. *Handbook of Educational Psychology*, 3, 295–308.
- Cicognani, E., Zani, B., Fournier, B., Gavray, C., & Born, M. (2012). Gender differences in youths' political engagement and participation. The role of parents and of adolescents' social and civic participation. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35(3), 561–576.
- Cogan, J., & Derricott, R. (2014). *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education*. Routledge.
- Dee, T. S. (2004). Are there civic returns to education? *Journal of Public Economics*, 88(9–10), 1697–1720.
- Dharma, S., Sapriya, S., Winataputra, U. S., & Komalasari, K. (2018). Civic Education and Student Responses to Global Issue. In *Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2018)*. Atlantis Press.
- Dunst, C. J., Hamby, D., Trivette, C. M., Raab, M., & Bruder, M. B. (2000). Everyday family and community life and children's naturally occurring learning opportunities. *Journal of*

Early Intervention, 23(3), 151–164.

- Eid, F. H. (2015). Citizenship, Community and National Identity: Young People Perceptions in a Bahraini Context. *Journal of Case Studies in Education*, 7, 1–32. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eric&AN=EJ1060644&site=ehost-live&scope=site>
- Elmi, A. A. (2016). Developing an Inclusive Citizenship in Somalia: Challenges and Opportunities. *Bildhaan: An International Journal of Somali Studies*, 16(1), 7.
- Evans, M., & Url, S. (2011). Educating for Citizenship : What Teachers Say and What Teachers Do Educating For Citizenship : What Teachers Say And What Teachers Do, 29(2), 410–435.
- Flanagan, C. A., Bowes, J. M., Jonsson, B., Csapo, B., & Sheblanova, E. (1998). Ties that bind: Correlates of adolescents' civic commitments in seven countries. *Journal of Social Issues*, 54(3), 457–475.
- García-Cabrero, B., Sandoval-Hernández, A., Treviño-Villareal, E., Ferráns, S. D., & Martínez, M. G. P. (2017). *Civics and Citizenship: Theoretical Models and Experiences in Latin America*. Springer.
- Gearon, L. (2015). How Do We Learn To Become Good Citizens? *British Educational Research Association*, (April).
- Geboers, E., Geijsel, F., Admiraal, W., & ten Dam, G. (2013). Review of the effects of citizenship education. *Educational Research Review*, 9, 158–173.
- Gregory, C., & Miyazaki, Y. (2018). Multilevel analysis of student civics knowledge scores. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 111(3), 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2016.1255869>
- Hart, S., & Wandeler, C. (2018). The Impact of Action Civics Service-Learning on Eighth-Grade Students' Civic Outcomes. *International Journal of Research on Service-Learning and Community Engagement*, 6(1), 1–17.
- Hayter, A. J. (1986). The maximum familywise error rate of Fisher's least significant difference test. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(396), 1000–1004.
- Hemed, M., & Tanzania, G. (2015). Cross-sectional studies. *Geneva Found Med Educ Res*, 43(1), 1–23.
- Johnson, M. R. (2017). Understanding College Students' Civic Identity Development: A Grounded Theory. *Journal of Higher Education Outreach and Engagement*, 21(3), 31–59.

- Keating, A., & Janmaat, J. G. (2015). Education through citizenship at school: Do school activities have a lasting impact on youth political engagement? *Parliamentary Affairs*, 69(2), 409–429.
- Keating, A., & Kerr, D. (2013). Putting participation into practice: re-evaluating the implementation of the Citizenship curriculum in England. Routledge.
- Keser, F., Akar, H., & Yildirim, A. (2011). The role of extracurricular activities in active citizenship education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(6), 809–837.
- Kim, H. R. (2013). Citizenship Education in Comparative Perspective: Cross-national Variation in the Effects of Family Background on Adolescents' Civic Outcomes. UCLA.
- Knowles, R. T., Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2018). Enhancing citizenship learning with international comparative research: Analyses of IEA civic education datasets. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 13(1), 7–30.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.
- Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C., & Morgan, G. A. (2014). *IBM SPSS for intermediate statistics: Use and interpretation*. Routledge.
- Lin, A. (2015). Citizenship education in American schools and its role in developing civic engagement: a review of the research. *Educational Review*, 67(1), 35–63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.813440>
- Martin, L. A., & Chiodo, J. J. (2007). Good citizenship: What students in rural schools have to say about it. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 35(1), 112–134.
- McIntosh, H., Hart, D., & Youniss, J. (2007). The influence of family political discussion on youth civic development: Which parent qualities matter? *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 40(3), 495–499.
- Menkhaus, K. (2014). State failure, state-building, and prospects for a “functional failed state” in Somalia. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 656(1), 154–172.
- Moeller, J., Kühne, R., & De Vreese, C. (2018). Mobilizing youth in the 21st century: How digital media use fosters civic duty, information efficacy, and political participation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 62(3), 445–460.
- Mouritsen, P., & Jaeger, A. (2018). *Designing Civic Education for Diverse Societies: Models, Tradeoffs, and Outcomes*. Migration Policy Institute Europe.

Neal, J. W., & Neal, Z. P. (2013). Nested or networked? Future directions for ecological systems theory. *Social Development*, 22(4), 722–737.

Nik Rosila, N. Y. (2013). An Islamic Perspective on the Role of Education in Responding to Social Issues Among Students in Malaysia. *US-China Education Review B*, 3(6), 2161–6248.

Oluniyi, O. (2011). Citizenship Education and Curriculum Development in Nigeria. *JSSE- Journal of Social Science Education*, 10(4), 61–67. <https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/jsse-v10-i4-1186>

Ong, S. F. (2012). Constructing a survey questionnaire to collect data on service quality of business academics.

Quigley, C. (1995). The Role of Civic Education. Task Force on Civic Education Paper.

Rossi, G., Lenzi, M., Sharkey, J. D., Vieno, A., & Santinello, M. (2016). Factors associated with civic engagement in adolescence: The effects of neighborhood, school, family, and peer contexts. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 44(8), 1040–1058.

Schmider, E., Ziegler, M., Danay, E., Beyer, L., & Bühner, M. (2010). Is it really robust? *Methodology*.

Schnall, A. H., Wolkin, A., & Nakata, N. (2018). Methods: Questionnaire Development and Interviewing Techniques. In *Disaster Epidemiology* (pp. 101–108). Elsevier.

Schulz, W., & Sibberns, H. (2004). *IEA Civic Education Study Technical Report*. Amsterdam: IEA.

Schulz, Wolfram, Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010a). ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in thirty-eight countries.

Schulz, Wolfram, Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010b). *Initial Findings from the IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study*. Dr. John Ainley.

Schulz, Wolfram, Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016a). *ICCS Assessment Framework 2016*. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-3-319-39357-5.pdf>

Schulz, Wolfram, Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016b). IEA international civic and citizenship education study 2016 assessment framework.

Setia, M. S. (2016). Methodology series module 3: Cross-sectional studies. *Indian Journal of Dermatology*, 61(3), 261.

- Taylor, L. K., Townsend, D., Merrilees, C. E., Goeke-Morey, M. C., Shirlow, P., & Cummings, E. M. (2019). Adolescent civic engagement and perceived political conflict: The role of family cohesion. *Youth & Society, 51*(5), 616–637.
- Thoits, P. A., & Hewitt, L. N. (2001). Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 115–131*.
- Torney-Purta, J., Amadeo, J.-A., & Andolina, M. W. (2010). A conceptual framework and multimethod approach for research on political socialization and civic engagement. *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth, 497–523*.
- Torney-Purta, J., & Barber, C. (2005). Democratic school engagement and civic participation among European adolescents: analysis of data from the IEA Civic Education Study. *JSSE-Journal of Social Science Education*.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., Schulz, W., Losito, B., & Mintrop, H. (2001). *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries: Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen*.
- Treviño, E., Béjares, C., Villalobos, C., & Naranjo, E. (2017). Influence of teachers and schools on students' civic outcomes in Latin America. *The Journal of Educational Research, 110*(6), 604–618.
- Venkatesh, V., Brown, S. A., & Bala, H. (2013). Bridging the qualitative-quantitative divide: Guidelines for conducting mixed methods research in information systems. *MIS Quarterly, 21–*
- Wilkenfeld, B., Lauckhardt, J., & Torney-Purta, J. (2010). The relation between developmental theory and measures of civic engagement in research on adolescents. *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth, 193–219*.
- Wilkenfeld, B., & Torney-Purta, J. (2012). A cross-context analysis of civic engagement linking CIVED and US: Census data. *JSSE-Journal of Social Science Education*.
- Zaff, J. F., Malanchuk, O., & Eccles, J. S. (2008). Predicting positive citizenship from adolescence to young adulthood: The effects of a civic context. *Applied Development Science, 12*(1), 38–53.
- Zaff, J. F., Malanchuk, O., Michelsen, E., & Eccles, J. (2003). Identity development and feelings of fulfillment: Mediators of future civic engagement. Retrieved May, 4, 2005.
- Zaff, J. F., & Michelsen, E. (2002). *Encouraging civic engagement: How teens are (or are not) becoming responsible citizens*. Child Trends.
- محمد, ت. (2016). قيم المواطنة الواجب توافرها في مناهج كلية التربية من وجهة نظر أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية: بحث ميداني لدى عينة من أعضاء الهيئة التدريسية في كلية التربية بجامعة دمشق.