Pedagogical Formation Students' Resistance Behaviors towards Teaching-learning Processes and Their Moral Maturity[*]

Türkan Argon[1,*], Gözde Sezen-Gültekin[2]

[1]Faculty of Education, Abant Izzet Baysal University, Turkey
[2]Faculty of Education, Sakarya University, Turkey

Abstract Moral maturity, defined as the competence in moral emotions, thoughts, judgments, attitudes and behaviors, is one of the most important qualities that the would-be teachers at Faculties of Education must possess. Teachers with moral maturity will train students with the qualities of reliability, responsibility, fairness, objectivity, consistency and legitimacy. Creation of positive classroom environments is crucial in the teaching-learning process to ensure that students achieve moral maturity. Although this process is mostly related to teacher competence, it is also affected by student behaviors because resistance behaviours towards the process may cause failure, negatively affect the quality of education and make teachers' tasks more difficult. This study set out to identify the relationship between pedagogical formation students' moral maturity and their views on resistance behaviors towards the teaching-learning process. The study utilized relational screening model. Universe of the study was composed of 650 students attending the formation program at Abant İzzet Baysal University in 2015-2016 academic year. *The Scale of Moral Maturity* and *Resistance Scale for Education Faculty Students* were used in the study as data collection tools. Means, standard deviation and correlation analyses were undertaken during data analysis. According to research results, in terms of the teaching-learning process, students agreed with resistance behaviors in class in general and in terms of the sub dimensions, students expressed they never displayed resistance behaviors in class, they were ambivalent about their personal and professional ideas about the instructors and relationships with friends and they didn't agree with future benefits of education. Students mainly selected the option of "rarely" in the moral maturity scale. A negative and low level significant relationship was found between students' moral maturity levels and their resistance behaviors towards the teaching-learning process.

Keywords Moral maturity, Resistance Behaviour, Teaching-learning Process, Pedagogical Formation Student

1. Problem Statement

Morality, defined as the belief and thought system related to abstaining from bad behaviours and partaking in good behaviours by one's own volition in order to reach goal [3] in the individual sense, refers to the principles and rules established to regulate social behaviours and relationships [12] in the social sense. Definitions of morality show that individuals not only engage in introspection while displaying behaviours but also take social conditions into account as well. After all, sanctions and compelling force of morality which includes the unwritten standards of behaviour on how to behave comes from the human conscience [10]. Moral maturity, the state of competence and culmination in terms of moral emotions, thoughts, judgments, attitudes and behaviors and the sum of moral qualities that warrant the richest, the most required and the most satisfactory meaning of the concept, manifests itself by sowing appropriate reactions to all immoralities ([29]; [18]). The basic moral qualities are honesty, keeping one's word, loyalty, justice and helping others [20] and individuals with moral maturity and integrity are expected to be reliable, responsible, respectful, fair, self-controlled and good persons in general who are also good citizens that obey the rules and the law [23]. However, environments such as the family and circle of friends and political, economic and technological conditions among the others affect human behaviour. Although increases in communication channels as a result of the advances in technological and scientific areas has enriched human life, it has also decreased social exchanges due to weakening of moral mores and have resulted in the increase of individualism and negative outcomes such as selfishness, irresponsibility, jealousy and arguments [26]. While the process has estranged people from moral values, it has also turned them into slaves of their pleasures and ambitions [34] who are perpetually dissatisfied. This state of affairs has increased the need for moral principles which will guide the relationships and behaviors in social life and bring the much

required rapport and harmony in relationships [32] and at the same time has emphasized the importance of educational systems that will ensure training individuals with moral values.

Any idea that affects, improves and ameliorates behaviors is regarded as a moral idea [24]. Since education is a process to ensure acquisition of specific behaviors, it is closely related to positive moral development. Education, a crucial tool that ensures social continuity, assists in the provision of order, peace and tranquillity and decreases individual differences in moral development [26]. As a matter of fact, one of the final goals of education is to raise moral individuals [22]. Any type of education that cannot help individuals acquire moral maturity does not duly perform its duties [9]. Learning the social and moral rules is not innate and can only occur during the process of socialization as a result of interacting with the environment [27]. In addition to family life, socialization process is experienced most rapidly and most intensively at schools [21]. Teachers undertake the most important roles and responsibilities in this process because the teaching profession represents moral maturity with its qualities related to competence as well as the behaviours it invokes [6] and people who have this profession are responsible from displaying behaviours that are compatible with ethical principles that regulate the tasks and actions with the stakeholders such as the society, family, schools and students [33]. As well as being role models for students with their attitudes and behaviors, teachers are also the individuals who know and point to the correct and acceptable behaviors in the society. Therefore, teachers do not only help students attain the terminal behaviors specified in the program, but also provide them with the correct and good behaviors that will not damage social life. In this context, one of the general goals of Turkish National Education system is to raise good individuals and citizens and hence, teachers who are responsible from moral education of students aim to educate free individuals with high morality that can make decisions based on their conscience and behave accordingly [12]. Therefore, it is rather crucial for teachers to have moral understanding in fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in raising individuals that adopt national and universal values, adapt to society and keep pace with change [6]. On the other hand, it should be kept in mind that social transformations also influence teacher behaviors and roles. This fact makes it necessary to question the moral systems of teachers who are responsible from understanding and changing student behaviors or helping them acquire new ones.

All teachers want to create positive classroom environments by effectively planning the teaching process to allow students to acquire both terminal behaviors and moral maturity. Although teachers are aware that the control of the process is based on their competences, they also know that sometimes they are hindered by student behaviors. In addition to positive student behaviors, there are negative behaviors some of which are displayed in the form of

resistance. These resistance behaviors are student tendencies and related behaviors that reflect defiance and opposition against educational activities at school ([13]; [31]). While these behaviors may originate from the mismatch between students' prior out of school acquisitions and the school, they may be also based on the teacher or the students themselves. It is in the hands of the teachers to notice and correct teacher originated behaviors but it is rather difficult to control and change student originated ones. Some examples of student originated resistance behaviors are being unresponsive and keeping quiet, experiencing unconformity during class, talking without permission, talking about unrelated topics and steering the teacher away from the content, making fun of teachers and finding them incompetent, taking pleasure from creating discordance and not taking classes seriously. These behaviors are thought and planned by the students beforehand and occur in a passive manner, therefore it is rather difficult to identify and eliminate them [30] and some students believe that it is their style whether the behaviors are correct or incorrect [19]. These behaviors may not be confused with undisciplined and undesired behaviors that occur spontaneously.

The fact that resistance behaviors are preplanned shows that students' beliefs, values, attitudes and habits are effective on these behaviors along with their moral judgments. Individuals' moral sentiments influence their moral behaviors ([4]; [20]; [6]). In other words, one of the basic factors that influence in-class teacher and student behaviors is moral judgments. While students with high levels of moral maturity can interact without intimidating other students and regard themselves as a part of the social group [28], students with low levels of moral maturity interact by displaying negative or undesired reactions or display obstructive behaviors. In that sense, it can be argued that students who display resistance behaviors are students with lower levels of moral maturity. It is important to identify resistance behaviors and their rationale in order to take necessary precautions as well as increasing the quality of education. Current study, undertaken in line with this requirement, discussed the relationship between students' resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes and moral maturity.

1.1. Purpose of the Study

This study aimed to identify the relationship between pedagogical formation students' moral maturity and their views on resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes. In this context, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What are pedagogical formation students' views on resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes and moral maturity?

2. Is there a meaningful relationship between their views on resistance behaviors towards teaching- learning processes and moral maturity?

2. Method

2.1. Research Model

The study utilized relational screening model. Relational screening model aims to determine the existence of change and/or level of this change between two or more variables[17].

2.2. Universe

Study universe was composed of 650 students attending pedagogical formation program at Abant İzzet Baysal University in 2015-2016 academic year. 411 of the participants were females and 239 were males; 424 were in 20-25 age range, 177 were in 26-30 age range; 49 were 31 and higher; 339 were teacher candidates in verbal areas (Turkish, history, philosophy etc.), 191 in quantitative areas (mathematics, physics, chemistry etc.) and 120 in areas that require field related skills and competences (physical education, art, music).

2.3. Data Collection Tool

The Scale of Moral Maturity and Resistance Scale for Education Faculty Students were used in the study as data collection tools. Scale of Moral Maturity, developed by Şengün and Kaya [29], consists of 66 items to measure individuals' moral maturity levels. Rating of the 5-point Likert type scale includes "yes always, most of the time, sometimes, rarely and no never". Cronbach Alpha internal

consistency coefficient was found to be .93. Resistance Scale for Education Faculty Students was developed by Yüksel to identify students' resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes. The scale is a 5-point Likert type scale with the following options "Completely agree, agree, undecided, disagree, completely disagree". Five sub dimensions of the scale with 23 items include "Resistance behaviors in class, Personal views regarding the instructors, Personal views regarding the professional qualities of instructors, Peer relations and Beliefs about the future benefits of education". Other than "Beliefs about the future benefits of education", all subscales have negative items which are scored in reverse. Total reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be .80. Reliability analyses for the current study provided Cronbach Alpha value of .83 for both The Scale of Moral Maturity and Resistance Scale for Education Faculty Students.

2.4. Data Analysis

Research data were analyzed using the SPSS program. Prior to analyses and evaluations, data distribution was examined via Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and it was found that data did not display normal distribution (p>.05). Hence, non-parametric tests were used in analysis; means and standard deviation were calculated and Spearman's Rho correlation analysis was undertaken. Correlation coefficient for the study was; r=0,00-0,25 very weak, r=0,26-0,49 weak, 0,50-0,69 medium, 0,70-0,89 high and 0,90-1,00 very high [16] and level of significance was accepted as .05.

3. Findings

3.1. Student Views on Moral Maturity and Resistance Behaviors

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Related to Moral Maturity and Resistance Behaviors Towards Teaching- Learning Processes

	Scales and Their Sub Dimensions	N	$\bar{X}$	SS
	Resistance behaviors in class	650	4,61	,660
Resistance Scale for Education Faculty Students	Personal views regarding the instructors	650	2,93	1,307
	Personal views regarding the professional qualities of instructors	650	3,11	,989
	Peer relations	650	3,26	,953
	Beliefs about the future benefits of education	650	2,38	1,146
	Total	650	3,53	,554
The Scale of Moral Maturity		650	2,31	,280

Examination of views presented in Table 1 regarding the Resistance Scale for Education Faculty Students, it is observed that student views for the sub dimensions of the scale were as follows: "Never" for Resistance behaviors in class ($\bar{X}$ =4,61); "Unsure" for Personal views regarding the instructors ($\bar{X}$ =2,93), Personal views regarding the professional qualities of instructors ($\bar{X}$ =3,11) and Peer relations ($\bar{X}$ =3,26); "Disagree" for Beliefs about the future benefits of education ($\bar{X}$ =2,38) and "Agree" for the whole scale ($\bar{X}$ =3,53). The students selected "rarely" in their views regarding The Scale of Moral Maturity ($\bar{X}$ =2,31). These findings show that pedagogical formation students displayed resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes and that their moral maturity levels were not at the desired level.

3.2. Relationship between Moral Maturity and Resistance Behaviors towards Teaching-Learning Processes

Table 2. Correlation Analysis on Student Views regarding Moral Maturity and Resistance Behaviors towards Teaching-Learning Processes

		Resistance behaviors in class	Personal views regarding the instructors	Personal views regarding the professional qualities of instructors	Peer relations	Beliefs about future benefits of education	Total
Moral Maturity	r	-,207**	-,097*	-,110**	-,076	,214**	-,121**

** p<.01; * p<.05

According to correlation coefficients presented in Table 2, negative and low level significant relationships were detected between students' moral maturity and Resistance behaviors in class (r=-,207, p<.01), Personal views regarding the instructors (r=-,097, p<.05) and Personal views regarding the professional qualities of instructors (r=-,110, p<.01) sub dimensions and positive and low level significant relationships were found with Beliefs about the future benefits of education (r=,214, p<.01) sub dimension of Resistance Scale for Education Faculty Students. No significant relationships were detected between Peer relations sub dimension and moral maturity. Negative and low level significant relationships were found between moral maturity and resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes in general (r=-,121, p<.01).

4. Result, Discussion and Suggestions

Regardless of grade level or school type, each student is valuable and wants to show his/her existence in the class via various behaviors and desires to be noticed. While some student behaviors are positive and terminal, some of them are undesired, negative or resistant. Especially the students who may think that they are regarded as objects without any human qualities will feel rather uncomfortable and discomposed ([5]; [14]) and this situation increases negative incidents like displaying resistance behaviors. Results of this study show that in general, pedagogical formation students displayed resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes. As a matter of fact, students were found to agree to the whole scale in general. In terms of sub dimensions, students were found not to display resistance behaviors in class, were undecided about their views on displays of resistance behaviors related to personal and professional qualities of the instructors and peer relations and displayed no resistance behaviors in Beliefs about the future benefits of education dimension. In terms of scale items, it was found that students did not display resistance behaviors in class such as talking with others in the classroom to inconvenience instructors, coming to class unprepared, talking during class without permission, having the instructors steer away from the topic by asking unrelated questions, making fun of instructors and feeling pleased from damaging classroom atmosphere. On the other hand, they were unsure whether resistance behaviors such as intolerance for the instructor, not desiring to take classes from the instructor and take a dislike to school because of the pressures from the instructor should be displayed related to views on personal qualities of the instructor and whether resistance behaviors such as believing that the instructor comes to class unprepared, finding the instructor incompetent academically and inability to be motivated due t the methods used by the instructor should be displayed related to views on professional qualities of the instructor. Similarly, they were found to be undecided in terms of peer relations sue to the limited number of persons in the class to make friends with, superficial relations with peers and feeling lonely in class. These findings can be regarded as indicators that students have some issues regarding instructors and peer relations and they did not find their instructors competent in personal and professional aspects. Ambivalent feelings about peer relations also show that in-class communication and interaction was not at the desired level. The reason underlying this ambivalence towards instructors and peer relations may be related to their formation student statuses because these students already graduated from different departments and they will be able to teach after being certified by this program. Most of these students commuted to the class from out of town and the classes were held at weekends from morning to evening. Therefore, these students make many sacrifices in terms of efforts and finances to obtain this certificate. In addition to undergoing a rather hard process, they also have to deal with their own personal problems. Considering the hardship, it can be argued that even the smallest piece of knowledge and skill that can be acquired with the help of the instructor is very valuable for them. These facts may have caused the participant students not to display resistance behaviors during classes and feel ambivalent about the instructors since they do not know the instructors well enough in the short time frame. The reason for ambivalent feelings related to peer relations may have been generated from the fact that they only came together with peers at the weekends and could not get to know each other well enough.

The findings show that students' moral maturity levels were not at the desired level. However, importance of schools in raising good students is increasing day by day [7]. It is not possible to claim that social life includes accurate principles with absolute impact which can be learned in the society that will ensure individuals' constant engagement with good, just, right and fine behaviors while refraining from unacceptable, unjust and repulsive behaviors [32]. In this respect, it is especially crucial for well-trained

individuals to display moral behaviors so that they can act as role models for others [25]. Considering the fact that formation students are the teachers of the future and that teachers are the role models for students, the finding of low moral maturity is conspicuous and unfortunately negative. Teaching profession is one of the leading professions that represents moral maturity and includes individuals that not only lead the students but also the society. Therefore, low levels o moral maturity is not a desired outcome for the teachers of the future and may be the cause of future problems. Assessment based on scale items pointed to the fact that formation students had various moral behavior problems in terms of positive behaviors such as noticing favors, acting respectfully towards the elderly, showing compassion towards the weak and powerless, keeping promises and acting in a right and jut manner in addition to moral behavior problems in terms of negative behaviors such as taking advantage of people's weaknesses, acting in the same manner when faced with disrespect, inability to show patience, inability to control emotions, using insults and invectives and inability to control disagreeable behaviors. These behavioral states can hinder the performance of normal psychological behaviors due the pressure they create and may direct students to states of tension and anger which may be reflected in impudent and unacceptable behaviors [6]. As a result, negative moral behaviors may occur such as inability to show patience, using insults, acting disrespectfully and inability to control oneself. According to Kohlberg's moral development theory, these types of student thoughts and positions can be associated with the conventional stage which is the second moral development stage. At this stage, individuals accept the behaviors as accurate as long as they satisfy others, try to look nice in the eyes of others and may display morally inappropriate behaviors when they encounter a negative event or a circumstance [8]. As a matter of fact, the positions of the participating students may be related to this issue since the certificate they will receive after investing so much in terms of efforts and finances is very important for them and is one of the prerequisites of teaching in Turkey where it is rather hard to hold a teaching position. Students want to obtain this certificate at all costs. Class discussions in which students express their position that they can do anything to receive this certificate attest to that. On the other hand, the fact that the youth is increasingly withdrawing from the life style based on moral principles and tending towards crime and morally inappropriate behaviors [11] support this position.

Since morality is an abstract concept and it is concretized by students in peer relations by transforming it into behaviors, increases in moral maturity which is a positive concept are expected to decrease resistance behaviors in teaching-learning processes. Research results support this expectation as well. As a matter of fact, a negative and low level significant relationship was detected between formation students' moral maturity levels and views on resistance behaviors during teaching-learning processes. In other words, this result can be interpreted in a manner that increases in students' moral maturity will decrease resistance behaviors during teaching-learning processes. Negative and significant relationships in the literature between moral maturity and bullying [15] and moral attitudes ad aggressiveness and violence [2] support this relation. One of the goals of the education process is to have students to acquire self-control skills by developing their self-regulation abilities. These skills are rather crucial especially for resistance and negative behaviors. These skills not only help students to develop socially acceptable moral understanding and healthy attitudes [1] but also support their positive development conscientiously and decrease negative behaviors. Assessment in terms of sub dimensions shows that increases in students' moral maturity levels decreases their resistance behaviors in class and their negative thoughts and beliefs regarding instructors' personal and professional qualities. Another important result of the study is related to the fact that increases in moral maturity causes slight increases in beliefs about future benefits of education. This finding shows that beliefs about the future benefits of education are positively affected from moral maturity because moral maturity affects education, careers and economic achievements of individuals [7]. Regarding the teaching profession, the society both expects teachers to be ideal human beings who practice what they preach and want them to contribute to students' learning about universal values. In terms of moral development, the function of teachers is to be a role model with their emotions thoughts and behaviors and to practice and transfer culture, values, norms, social conventions and morals during in class activities [21]. In this sense, it can be argued that it is crucial to increase moral maturity levels and decrease resistance behaviors in formation students who are the students of today but the teachers of tomorrow.

Suggestions developed in line with research findings are as follows: measures can be taken to regulate learning conditions of formation students. For instance, lessons can be planned and offered at different times to generate the best impact instead of offering them at weekends in block formats. Elective classes can be included in the program to increase student awareness related to moral maturity or seminars or conferences can be organized. Student awareness related to resistance behaviors can be increased in classes that focus on class management and similar topics in order to eliminate students' resistance behaviors towards teaching-learning processes.

Note

*The abstract of this paper was presented at 2nd International Conference on Lifelong Learning and Leadership for All (ICLEL-16), in Liepaja on July, 21-23, 2016.

REFERENCES

[1] Ada, S. ve Çetin, M. (2002). *Eğitim ve Öğretim Ortamında Disiplin Nedir?* Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

[2] Avcı, A. (2010). Eğitimde Şiddet Olgusu Lise Öğrencilerinde Şiddet, Saldırganlık ve Ahlaki Tutum İlişkisi. Küçükçekmece İlçesi Örneği. Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi, İstanbul Aydın, M. Z. (2010). *Ailede Ahlak Eğitimi*. İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları.

[3] Aydın, İ. (2011). Öğretmenlik mesleği etiği. http://inayetaydin.blogspot.com.tr/2011/09/ogretmenlik-mesl ek- etigi.html 25.04.2016.

[4] Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.

[5] Bastian, B. ve Haslam, N. (2010). Excluded from humanity: The dehumanizing effects of social ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 46, 107-113.

[6] Çekin, A. (2013). Öğretmen adaylarının ahlaki olgunluk düzeyleri. *Kastamonu Eğitim Dergisi*, 21(3), 1035- 1048.

[7] Çelik, V. (2014). Okullarda moral sermayenin geliştirilmesi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 39 (174), 67-74.

[8] Çitemel, N. (2010). Lisansüstü Öğrencilerinin Ahlaki Yargı Yetenekleri ile Psikolojik Belirtileri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Sakarya Üniversitesi, Adapazarı.

[9] Dilmaç, B. (2012). *İnsanca Değerler Eğitimi.* Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.

[10] Doğan, S. ve Karataş, A. (2011). Örgütsel etiğin çalışan memnuniyetine etkisi üzerine bir araştırma. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 37, 1-40.

[11] Ekşi, H. (2003). Temel insani değerlerin kazandırılmasında bir yaklaşım: Karakter eğitimi programları. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi,* 1(l), 79-96.

[12] Erdem, H. (2003). *Ahlak Felsefesi*. Konya: Hü-Er Yayınları.

[13] Giroux, A. H. (2001). *Theory and Resistance in Education*. London: Bergin and Garvey.

[14] Haque, O. S. ve Waytz, A. (2012). Dehumanization in medicine: Causes, solutions, and functions. *Perspectives on Psychological Science,* 7, 176-186.

[15] Kakçı, K. (2009). İlköğretim 4. ve 5. Sınıf Öğrencilerinin Ahlaki Olgunluk Düzeyleri İle Duygu Zorbalık Eğilimleri Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Yeditepe Üniversitesi, İstanbul.

[16] Kalaycı, Ş. (2008). *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri*. Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım.

[17] Karasar, N. (2011). *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

[18] Kaya, M. ve Aydın, C. (2011). Üniversite öğrencilerinin dini inanç ile ahlaki olgunluk düzeyleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, 30, 15-42.

[19] Kearney, P., Plax, T.G. ve Burroughs, N.F. (1991). An attributional analysis of college students resistance decisions. *Communication Education,* 40, 325-342.

[20] Kırel, Ç. (2004). Örgütlerde etik ve davranış yönetimi. (Ed. E. Özkalp). *Örgütsel Davranış* İçinde. ss. 229-245. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.

[21] Köseoğlu, A. (2015). Öğretmen adaylarının ahlak kavramına ilişkin metafor kullanımları. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi,* 4(3), 219-225.

[22] Kulaksızoğlu, A. (1998). *Ergenlik Psikolojisi*. İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.

[23] Lickona, T. E. (1991). *Educating for Character: How Our Schools can Teach Respect and Responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books.

[24] Oğuzkan, A.F. (1977). Okulda ahlâk eğitimi. *Ankara Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Fakültesi Dergisi*, 9(1). http://dergiler.ankara.edu.tr/detail.php?id=40&sayi_id=496& makale_id=5860. 25.04.2016

[25] Onat Kocabıyık, O. ve Kulaksızoğlu, A. (2014). Genç yetişkinlerin ahlaki kimliklerinin incelenmesine yönelik nitel bir araştırma. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 14(3), 835-858.

[26] Özen, Y. (2011). Etik mi? Ahlak mı? Modernite mi? Medeniyet mi? (Değerler eğitiminde sosyal psikolojik bir yaklaşım). *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3(5), 63-87.

[27] Özyürek, A. ve Tezel Şahin, F. (2015). Anne-çocuk ilişkisinin ve baba tutumlarının çocukların ahlaki ve sosyal kural anlayışları üzerine etkisi. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 40(177), 161-174.

[28] Sarıçam, H., Çelik, İ., Arıcı, N. ve Kaya, M. M. (2014). Ergenlerde insani değerler ve ahlaki olgunluk arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi. *International Journal of Human Sciences*. *11*(1), 1325-1342.

[29] Şengün, M. ve Kaya, M. (2007). Ahlaki olgunluk ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. *Ondokuz Mayıs Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi Dergisi,* 24-25, 51-64.

[30] Yüksel, S. (2004a). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik meslek bilgisi derslerine yönelik direnç davranışları. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 4(1), 171-200.

[31] Yüksel, S. (2004b). Eğitim fakültesi öğrencilerinin öğrenme- öğretme süreçlerine yönelik direnç davranışları. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi,* 2(3), 431-354.

[32] Yüksel, M. (2015). Etik kodlar, ahlak ve hukuk. *Hacettepe HFD*, 5(1), 9-26.

[33] Tunca, N., Alkın Şahin, S., Sever, D. ve Çam Aktaş, B. (2015). Teachers' level of compliance to ethical values based on secondary students' perceptions. *Eğitimde Kuram ve Uygulama,* 11(2), 398-419.

[34] Turiel, E. (2002). *Çocukluk Çağında Toplumsal Uslamlamanın Doğası ve Temelleri. Etiğin Doğal Temelleri*. (Ed. Changeux, J. P). Çev: Acar, N. İstanbul: Doruk Yay.