

*Full Length Research Paper*

# Value tendency differences between pre-service social studies teachers within the scope of the East and the West

Ahmed Emin Osmanoğlu

Department of Sociology, Bingöl University, Bingöl, Turkey.

Received 27 July, 2017; Accepted 8 September, 2017

This study aims to comparatively examine the values that the students of the Department of Social Studies in Education Faculty at two universities located in the Eastern and Western parts of Turkey desire to find in people they interact with. Multiple methods, including quantitative and qualitative methods, were used in this study. The research was first shaped through content analysis method based on the qualitative research model and then through relational and statistical analysis based on the quantitative research model. The participants of this study were 84 students in total, 47 students from Marmara University in Istanbul from Western Anatolia and 37 students from Kafkas University in Kars from Eastern Anatolia. 48 of the students were female and 36 were male. The data were collected via questionnaires given to senior students at both universities. The qualitative data were analyzed through content analysis while the quantitative data were analyzed by Pearson Chi-Square, Yatest Chi-Square (Continuity Correction) and Fisher's Exact Test techniques. The statistical significance level was taken as  $P < 0.05$ . The findings obtained from this research can be summarized as follows: students who participated in the study desire to find the values of effective communication, peace, honesty, maturity, sharing, unity, intellectuality, intelligence, personal care, culture and Atatürkism in the people they interact with. The pre-service social studies teachers are in compliance with the values included in the curriculum of the Department of Social Studies to a great extent. The findings of the present research have some similarities and differences compared to the studies of Spranger, Rokeach, and Schwartz. They desire to find values difference in gender; there are some similarities and differences between the values found by the research findings and the values included in the curriculum. Almost all female students and majority of male students initially look for the value of Effective Communication in people they interact with and the value of Unity is not important for the students at either of the universities. Peace values are important for the students in both universities; almost half of the Eastern and Southern Anatolians and some of the Western Anatolians desire to see the value of honesty in people they interact with. There are no general differences between the value preferences of the Eastern and Western people.

**Key words:** Social studies teaching, value orientations, value education, university youth, eastern-western difference.

## INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, people have created or accepted beliefs, paradigms, and values about what is right and what is wrong; what they need to do and avoid in order to

maintain their individual and social lives; to get what they want and to get away from their fear. These beliefs, values and paradigms that they have created or accepted

sometimes cause expected or unexpected consequences. People search for ways to avoid unexpected situations, improve and sustain positive consequences through philosophy, art, ideology, science, and particularly social sciences. Thus, values became a subject of research conducted through scientific methods in social sciences in 20th century (Bas, 2014).

The concept of value has been used first by social scientists by way of remaining loyal to the Latin etymology of the word, "*valere*", which refers to be strong and valued. The first sociological definition of values was made by Thomas and Znaniecki (1918). According to them, value is an observable reference point that brings a sense of meaning to the objective of the action which is first accepted and performed by all members of a social group. According to this definition, a food item, instrument, coin, poem, school, legend and a scientific theory can be a value. Value is a concept that instigates human behaviors, expresses the characteristic feature of a group or unique feature of an individual, determines the way, means and purposes of an action and is internalized by the actor of the action. A complete sociological theory of the concept of value was created by Parsons et al. (1962) (Korkmaz, 2013).

Value is also defined as all kinds of social, humanistic, ideological or divine feelings, thoughts, behaviors, rules and assets that are accepted and lived by among people (Celikkaya, 1999). The common feature of values at all times and in societies is the fact that values ensure the continuity of a given community or society. Values specify what is good or bad, what is important, in short, how the individual should live with people in the society (Akbas, 2008). Values shortly direct behavior and people's behavior towards each other (Baysal and Samanci, 2009).

According to these definitions, it can be understood that values are principles and beliefs that help individuals guide their lives, establish social relations, determine priorities, and make social life possible and meaningful, both to distinguish between and harmonize societies (Yazici, 2013). In addition, they are effective factors in guiding the behaviors of people and in shaping their lives. Values have great importance in explaining human behaviors (Yel and Aladag, 2009)

Rokeach (1973) argues that the concept of value should be placed at the center of social sciences. According to him, this concept is an intervening variable, which promises to combine the seemingly different interests of all the sciences related to human behavior more successfully than others. It is very important to examine and understand values as they reveal themselves in every aspect (Rokeach, 1973).

Spranger (1928) collects values from six groups: aesthetic, theoretical, economic, political, social and religious values. In 1960, Allport et al. (1960) turned this into a scale (Akbas, 2004). In 1974, Keskin, 2016 classified values as personal values, group values, and social values. In 1992 and 2006, Schwartz (1992) identified 10 core value groups and ranked 56 values corresponding to these groups. Value groups identified by Schwartz (2006) are power, success, hedonism, alertness, self-orientation, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity and security. Apart from these classifications, there are also other classifications (Keskin, 2016, Mehmedoglu, 2007, Kusdil and Kagitcibasi, 2000). Taking stand from different points of view, values are categorized according to a varieties such as general and special, universal and local, sacred and profan, primary and secondary (Schwartz, 2006; Emre and Yapi, 2015 as cited in Schwartz, 2006).

These values and others can be gained by individuals during the process of effective education and training process in consideration of genetic factors and environmental conditions. Acquisition of values also takes place among the functions of education which aims to acquire knowledge, skills, attitudes and positive habits. It is expected from education and training processes that many humanistic, moral, social, national, religious, scientific personal qualities and values such as responsibility, diligence, honesty, objectivity, aesthetics, philanthropy, giving importance to family unity, cleanliness, patriotism and fairness are acquired through education.

The most important functions of education, socialization and transferring the value judgments of the society to the next generation will thus be accomplished (Ulusoy and Tay, 2011; Akbas, 2008; Zabun, 2013; Keskin, 2015; Eksi, 2003).

To prevent material, spiritual, individual and social problems caused by alienation and fed by modernity brings an importance to values and the place of these values in education. For this reason, curricula have begun to emphasize values (Ozturk and Balci, 2009). In Turkey, Regulation on Primary Education Institutions issued by the Ministry of National Education's (MoNE, 2013) aims to develop and respect the national and universal values of education among other aims of primary education. Furthermore, the values that should be acquired by students are listed in 2004 Social Studies Curriculum (MoNE, 2004).

According to Kan (2010), social studies is a course for value education. The content of the social studies course is important in terms of value teaching because this course includes a historical feature. It tells different

E-mail: ahmed\_osmanoglu@yahoo.com.

Authors agree that this article remain permanently open access under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

cultures and life stories, and it has a multidisciplinary structure. Carrying the responsibility of social engineering, the Social Studies course has a duty to improve our disrupted culture and values. Social studies education has a responsibility to provide individuals with democratic values, attitudes and beliefs, to raise awareness towards values they have and to make them aware of the impact of these values on their interactions with other people (Kan, 2010; Bagci, 2007; Doganay, 2011). Problems such as widespread violence tendencies, substance dependence, proliferation of suicidal tendencies, decrease in the awareness of individual and social responsibility, the attack of local values in the process of colonial globalization and the dependence of the national existence and presence of political power to the protection of mutual value system in modern societies in this day and age, increase the importance of value education (Deveci et al. 2009; Cavdarci, 2002).

Values education include the full range of activities that are carried out to train people, such as understanding one another, tolerating one another, and developing social sensitivity (Eksi and Katilmis, 2011). In addition, the values of the teachers who will give this training become very important. Teachers are expected to be role models in the classroom, to create a common social texture and to bring various values to the students (Dilmac, 1999).

As much as making these values a part of teaching programs, it is also important to what extent the students can acquire and translate these values into reality. In this scope, the detection of to what extent the values are acquired by the students and how they can transfer these values into life can contribute to the more effective education on values. At the same time, the description of the current situation in values education, the identification of problems experienced during the education and bringing suggestions for the solution of these problems can shed light on the organization of future practices (Güven et al., 2014).

Vocational education institutions attract the attention of social scientists as places where knowledge and skills, as well as values and attitudes related to that profession are first acquired. Studies investigating the effect of education on student attitudes date back to ancient times (Kasapoglu, 1992). In this study, the value orientations of the students in the department of social studies teachings were determined.

## METHODOLOGY

This study aims to comparatively examine the values that the students of the Department of Social Studies Teaching at Kafkas University located in the east and Marmara University located in the west of Turkey, desire to find in people they interact with.

### Research design

In this study, multiple methods including quantitative and qualitative

methods were used. It is possible to acquire in-depth knowledge in the social environment with the qualitative method, and to determine the causality relation between variables, statistical probabilities and definite results with quantitative methods (Boke, 2009). The pattern used in qualitative research is a strategy that determines the approach of the research and guides the consistency of the various stages within the framework of this approach. The qualitative research design guides the researcher while carrying out the research activities in a coherent and appropriate manner (Yildirim and Simsek, 2008). In this context, the present study was first carried out by means of content analysis based on the qualitative research model and then by the relational and statistical analysis based on the quantitative research model.

### Main problem and sub-problems of the research

The main research question of the study is:

What are the values that students of the Department of Social Studies Teaching want to find in people they interact with?

Sub-questions of the research are as follows:

1. What are the values that students of the Department of Social Studies Teaching in Faculty of Education at Marmara University and Kafkas University want to find in people they interact with?
2. Do the values that students of the Department of Social Studies Teaching in Faculty of Education at Marmara University and Kafkas University want to find in people they interact with differ by gender?
3. Do the values that students of the Department of Social Studies Teaching in Faculty of Education at Marmara University and Kafkas University want to find in people they interact with differ by university?
4. Is there any difference between the students who were born in Western Anatolia and those who were born in Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia in terms of the values they want to find in people they interact with?

### Participants of the research

Fourth grade students expected to graduate in 2016 from the Department of Social Studies Teaching in Faculty of Education at Marmara and Kafkas participated in the research. The students of the department have taken courses on Value Education, which is included in the content of the social studies course, and the concept of value has not been missing in their curriculum throughout the education process. For this reason, these students were assumed to be appropriate participants for a study on values. These are students from Marmara University located in Istanbul, west of Turkey, and the students of Kafkas University located in Kars, east of Turkey.

Marmara University was founded in 1883 and Kafkas University was founded in 1992. While Marmara University is regarded as a well-established and developed university in Turkey, Kafkas University is considered relatively developing in terms of the quantity and quality of its staff and students. Istanbul, where Marmara University is located, is a developed city while Kars, where Kafkas University is located, is underdeveloped and deprived of socio-economic means.

A minimum of 393 points was required for registering into the Department of Social Sciences Teaching in Faculty of Education at Marmara University and 360 points was required for registering into Kafkas University from the university entrance exam in 2012, when the students of both universities started their university education (ÖSYS, 2012). For this reason, Marmara University students represent the more successful mass. In this way, it is aimed to

measure whether value orientations differ by success and equipment factors of the universities.

A total of 84 students, being 37 from Kafkas University in Eastern Anatolia and 47 students from Marmara University in Western Anatolia, participated in this study. 48 of the students are female and 36 are male. Selecting participants from different genders is to measure whether gender is an effective variable in value preferences.

Of all participants, 43 students were born in Eastern and Southeastern regions of Turkey and 37 students were born in Western Anatolia Region. In this way, it is planned to measure whether the birth place of students is an effective variable in the value preference.

### Data collection

The data were collected via questionnaires given to senior students at both universities. The questionnaire has two sections. In the first section, information on students' gender, university, grade and place of birth are included. The second section includes the question;

"What are the characteristics you want to have in people you interact with in your daily life, either by will or compulsorily?"

In order not to use any restriction, the value word was particularly not used in the question.

### Data analysis

In this research, qualitative and quantitative research methods are used together. There is no single methodological framework in the analysis of qualitative data. Analysis can be carried out in different ways (Neumann, 2008; Punch, 2005). In this framework, content analysis study was conducted on the questionnaire forms distributed to the students. This analysis is a method of examining the contents of texts within certain rules in order to analyze the dimensions of current communication and make inferences about certain dimensions of social reality that are not available in the text (Gokce, 2006). In other words, it is a research method that allows the textual content, themes or patterns within the text to be coded, defined, and subjectively interpreted within the systematic classification process (Zhang and Widemuth, 2009 as cited in Hsieh and Shannon, 2005). The main purpose of content analysis is to reach concepts and associations that can explain the collected data. It is to find out the facts that may be hidden in data by defining them (Yildirim and Simsek, 2008). The sub-questions or objectives extracted from the research question in the content analysis constitute the basic backbone of the research. Each stage of the research is explained, from the viewpoint of the research questions (Gokce, 2006). In this context, this study is structured based on research questions.

### Forming category system

Forming the category system is the first and most important step in the transformation of the research question into a systematic method of analysis. Berelson (1952) indicates that the main structure of content analysis is the categories. The answers given by the students in order to form the mentioned categories were coded with a concept of value. Then, the value categories to express common coding were established. When similar value categories appear, these categories were also linked to a higher category. In this way, top and sub value categories were formed. The top value categories and their sub-value categories are presented in Table 1.

As presented in Table 1, the categories of effective communication, unity, peace and peace values have created top value categories, which are linked to sub-value categories. The top-value category of effective communication consists of the sub-value categories of interest, proper speaking, sincerity, cordiality, assertiveness and optimism. The top-value category of unity consists of sub-value categories of patriotism, family, conformity, love and responsibility. The top-value category of peace consists of sub-value categories of reconciliation, respect, kindness, tolerance and unifying. The top-value category of honesty consists of sub-value categories of Honesty, consistency, morality, bravery, fairness, and virtuousness. Other value categories which do not have any sub-value categories are the categories of maturity, sharing, intelligence, intellectuality, personal care, culture, and Atatürkism values.

The categories used in this study were formed by the inductive analysis approach taking stand from the answers of the students to the relevant questions. The categorization was finalized by reaching a consensus of the researcher and two experts from the field.

### Reliability test and validity

Reliability in content analysis depends on whether or not people who keep tally understand text in the same way. Performing the tasks of categorization of coding by one person increases the reliability. In this case, the correlation between the tallies kept by the same person at different times must be high. In addition, the coding is to be tested by experts in the field and the consensus between them is checked. A consensus at the rate of 80% indicates the reliability/consistency of the study (Inal, 2004).

In this study, the procedure was conducted by a single researcher. At the time of categorization, the opinions of 2 experts in educational sciences were also consulted and the experts reached a consensus. In case of every inconsistent code recognized during the coding or the decision change related to the coding, the coding procedure was reversed by canceling. Once the coding style was consistent, it was re-encoded after one week. A full coding partnership was detected between the two encodings.

In order to ensure the internal validity and credibility of the study, the coding was conducted once again by 2 educational sciences experts without taking any samples. A minimum of 88% of consensus was achieved for each category in all of the coding. By discussing the differences, a full consensus was achieved. Thus, the credibility and credibility (internal validity) of the coding and categorization conducted accordingly were ensured.

Gokce (2006) states that in the content analysis of textbooks, there is no other validity measure other than the definitions of the categories. If the categorizations are made publicly identifiable and thus form an opinion that the research scale actually measure what it actually aims to measure, then the validity of the study will be ensured. In this research, the categories were not previously formed, yet created according to the data obtained in accordance with the nature of the research questions. Table 1 shows the associations between categories and codes.

### Coding of the data and formation of the findings

At this stage, the entire data collection forms were read over and over again. Each coding was recorded in the excel chart. In this way, code lists were created to work in more detail. The words or concepts in the code lists were under a value category and it was whether or not subcategories would be created when the coding is finished. In the study, the weightless scores of the categories are presented as frequency (f) and percentage (%). The part of the research that applied the quantitative method was structured according to the research questions regarding the variables of

**Table 1.** Top and sub-value categories and relevant codes.

<b>Value categories</b>	<b>Codes of the category</b>
<b>Sub-value categories of the top category of effective communication value</b>	
Category of interest value	Good listener, eye contact, not interrupting one's speech, care, appreciation
Category of proper speech value	Speak properly, speak briefly but to the point, speak fluently, not speaking implicitly, adjusting tone, using body language, not speaking rudely, being pleasant to chat with, introducing himself/herself, using "you" language, not mocking
Category of sincerity value	Sincerity, not being involved in a relationship based on self-interest
Category of cordiality value	Being friendly, fun, appealing
Category of assertiveness value	Assertiveness, self-confidence, not being attached to details
Category of Optimism Value	Being positive, optimism
<b>Sub-value categories of the top category of unity value</b>	
Category of patriotism value	Loving the homeland, having national values
Category of family value	Caring about the family
Category of conformity value	Reflectiveness, sharing the same idea
Category of love value	Love
Category of responsibility value	Responsibility
<b>Sub-value categories of the top category of peace value</b>	
Category of reconciliation value	Reconciliation
Category of respect value	Respect to opinion, respect to human right
Category of modesty value	Not judging people, knowing thy self, knowing one's place
Category of kindness value	Kindness, politeness, not being rude
Category of tolerance value	Tolerance, understanding, thoughtful, sensitive, empathic, not being sensitive, sacrificing, being well-intentioned, benevolent, religious sensitivity
Category of unifying value	Not being racist, not being discriminative, being satisfied with the environment
<b>Sub-Value Categories of the Top Category of Honesty Value</b>	
Category of honesty value	Being frank, not being a liar, not changing ideas according to the medium, keeping promises, reliability,
Category of consistency value	Consistency in feeling, thought and speaking
Category of moral value	Having moral, being honorable, sense of shame
Category of bravery value	Not being a gossip
Category of fairness value	Being fair, being conscientious
Category of virtuousness value	Being virtuous
Category of maturity value	Seriousness, formality, maturity, manner, being calm, being civilized, decency, making too many hand and arm movements, not being involved in private areas of people
Category of sharing value	Not being selfish, sharing problems, benevolence, generosity
Category of intelligence value	Practicability, planning, programming, regularity, problem solving, intelligence
Category of intellectuality value	Reading books, being intellectual, multidimensional thinking, being open minded, critical thinking, resistance to suppression, being knowledgeable, having vision, being ideal, possessing a fascination
Category of personal care value	Dental health, compatible dressing
Category of culture value	Listening to classical music, being interested in culture, being interested in art
Category of Atatürkism value	Loving Atatürk

gender, school and birth regions. Statistical analysis methods were used to answer these questions. To this end, IBM Statistical Package for Social Science 21.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL) program was used. Pearson Chi-Square, Yates Chi-Square (Continuity Correction), and Fisher's Exact Test techniques were applied for the analysis of the dataset. Statistical significance level was taken as  $P < 0.05$ .

## FINDINGS

### The values that students want to find in people they interact with?

Findings related to the first sub-question of the research

**Table 2.** Frequency and percentage distribution of desired values according to categories.

Values	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Values of effective communication	77	29.62
Values of peace	70	26.92
Values of honesty	35	13.46
Values of maturity	20	7.69
Values of sharing	16	6.15
Values of unity	14	5.38
Values of intellectuality	12	4.62
Values of intelligence	8	3.08
Values of personal care	5	1.92
Cultural values	2	0.77
Value of Atatürkism	1	0.38

**Table 3.** Frequency and percentage distribution of the value of effective communication by gender.

Gender	Preference of the value		Total	
	Frequency (f)	Percentage	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Female	47	97.92	48	100
Male	30	83.33	36	100

are presented within this section. To this end, the answers of Marmara and Kafkas University students were assessed through content analysis. The values that students want to find in people they interact with are collected under eleven top categories. These are presented in Table 2. According to Table 2, the students stated that they primarily want to find the following values in people they interact with; effective communication for 77 times (29.62%); peacefulness, 70 times (26.92%); accuracy, 35 times (13.46%); maturity, 20 times (7.69%); sharing, 16 times (6.15%); unity, 14 times (5.38%); intellectuality, 12 times (4.62%); intelligence, 8 times (3.08%); personal care, 5 times (1.92%); cultural values, 2 times (0.77%); and Atatürkism, 1 time (0.38%).

#### **The variation in the values that students want to find in people they interact with by gender**

Findings related to the second sub-question of the research are presented in this section. Pearson Chi-Square test was applied between gender and the preferred values to detect whether the desired values differ by gender. A significant relationship was found between gender and the value of effective communication ( $p = 0.039$ ). The results of females and males preferring the effective communication are presented in Table 3. According to Table 3, 47 (97.92%) of the female students and 30 (83.33%) of the male students want to find the value of effective

communication in the people they interact with. Effective communication is a prioritized value for both genders. However, female students' preference of this value is significantly higher than that of male students. There is a significant relationship between gender and intellectuality ( $p = 0.039$ ). The results of the females and males preferring the effective communication are presented in Table 4. According to Table 4, 2 of the female students (4.17%) and 10 of the male students (27.78%) prefer to find the value of intellectuality in people they interact with, 46 of the female (95.83%) and 26 of the male (72.22%) did not prioritize this value. The value of intellectuality does not have a high priority for either genders. However, female students' preference of this value is significantly lower than that of male students. While there is a difference between the values of effective communication and intellectuality by gender, the preference of other values does not differ by gender.

#### **Variation of values between the students of Marmara and Kafkas Universities**

Findings related to the third sub-question of the research are presented in this section. Whether or not there is a difference in the values desired by the students of two universities was analyzed. Significant relationships were found between the universities in terms of the values of unity ( $p = 0.049$ ) and peace ( $p = 0.049$ ). Findings regarding the comparison of the universities in terms of

**Table 4.** Frequency and percentage distribution of the value of intellectualism by gender.

Gender	Preference of the value		Total	
	Frequency (f)	%	Frequency (f)	%
Female	2	4.17	48	100
Male	10	27.78	36	100

**Table 5.** Frequency and percentage distribution of the value of unity by university.

University	Preference of the value		Total	
	Frequency (f)	Percentage	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Marmara	4	8.51	47	100
Kafkas	10	27.03	37	100

**Table 6.** Frequency and percentage distribution of the value of peace by university.

University	Preference of the value		Total	
	Frequency (f)	Percentage	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Marmara	43	91.49	47	100
Kafkas	27	72.97	37	100

the value of unity are presented in Table 5. According to Table 5, 4 (8.51%) of the students at Marmara University and 10 (27.03%) of the students at Kafkas University desire to primarily find the value of unity in people they interact with. The value of unity is not very important for students of both universities. However, Kafkas students' preference of this value is significantly higher than that of Marmara students. Findings regarding the comparison of the universities in terms of the value of peace are presented in Table 6. According to Table 6, 43 (91.49%) of the students at Marmara University and 27 (72.97%) of the students at Kafkas University desire to primarily find the value of peace in people they interact with. The value of peace is not very important for the students of either universities. However, Marmara students' preference of this value is significantly higher than that of Kafkas students.

#### **Value preferences of the students by birth regions**

There is a significant relationship between students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia and those from the Western Anatolia in terms of the value of peace ( $p = 0.019$ ). Findings regarding the comparison of regions in terms of the value of peace are presented in Table 7.

According to Table 7, 31 (72.1%) of the students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia and 35 (94.6%) of the students from the Western Anatolia attach importance

to the value of peace in people they interact with. Students from both universities attach importance to the value of peace. However, preference of this value by the students from the Western Anatolia is significantly higher than that of the students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia. There is a significant relationship between students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia and those from the Western Anatolia in terms of the value of honesty ( $p = 0.034$ ). Findings regarding the comparison of regions in terms of the value of honesty are presented in Table 8.

According to Table 8, 24 (55.8%) of the students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia and 11 (29.7%) of the students from the Western Anatolia desire to find the value of honesty in people they interact with. The preference of this value by the students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia is significantly higher than that of the students from the Western Anatolia. There are differences between the priorities of the students in terms of the values of peace and honesty by birth regions. There is no difference in value preferences among the other value categories.

#### **DISCUSSION**

The values that were desired most intensively by the students in people they interact with are; effective communication, peace, honesty, maturity, sharing, unity,

**Table 7.** Frequency and percentage distribution of the peace value preference of students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia and students from the Western Anatolia.

Regions	Preference of the value		Total	
	Frequency (f)	Percentage	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Student from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia	31	72.1	43	100
Student from the Western Anatolia	35	94.6	37	100

**Table 8.** Frequency and percentage distribution of the honesty value preference of students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia and students from the Western Anatolia.

Regions	Preference of the value		Total	
	Frequency (f)	Percentage	Frequency (f)	Percentage
Students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia	24	55.8	43	100
Students from the Western Anatolia	11	29.7	37	100

**Table 9.** Matching the values in the curriculum with the values in the research finding.

Values in social studies curriculum	Values in the research findings
Caring about family unity	Value of family
Being fair	Value of being fair
Independence	Value of patriotism
Peace	Value of peace
Freedom	Value of patriotism
Objectivity	Value of intellectuality
Solidarity	Value of sharing
Sensitivity	Value of kindness, value of tolerance
Honesty	Value of honesty
Aesthetic	Value of personal care, cultural value
Tolerance	Value of tolerance
Hospitality	Value of sharing
Love	Value of love
Respect	Value of respect
Responsibility	Value of responsibility
Cleaning	Value of personal care
Patriotism	Value of patriotism
Benevolence	Value of sharing
Diligence	(N/A)
Caring about health	(N/A)

intellectuality, intelligence, personal care, cultural values and Atatürkism, respectively. When these values are compared with the values in the Social Studies Curriculum of the Ministry of Education which was enforced in 2017 as presented in Table 9.

According to Table 9, there is a significant similarity between the values that the students of the pre-service Social studies teachers want to see in people they interact with and the values included in the Social Studies curriculum. This similarity can be explained by the fact

that pre-service teachers are influenced by their curriculum and the mentioned values, except for Atatürkism, are universal human values.

As presented in Table 9, pre-service teachers did not emphasize the value of diligence and caring about health. This is about asking pre-service teachers about the values they expect the people they interact with. The diligence and health of the other person is not about the person who is interacting with him/her. For this reason, these two values could not be detected in this study. If



**Table 10.** Comparison of value categories in this research and Spranger (2005) value categories.

<b>Spranger (2004) value categories</b>	<b>Value categories in this research</b>
Social value	Values of interest, patriotism, family, love, consociationalism, respect, humility, kindness, tolerance, unifying, honesty, braveness, being fair and sharing
Aesthetic value	Values proper speech, compliance, consistency and personal care
Being politic	Value of assertiveness
Religious Value	Tolerance
Economy	Intelligence
Speculativeness	Intellectuality

**Table 11.** Comparison of value categories in this research and Rokeach (1973) value categories.

<b>Rokeach (1973) value categories</b>	<b>Value categories in this research</b>
Values of happiness, joyful, affection	Value of cordiality
Values of independence, bravery	Value of assertiveness
Value of freedom	Value of patriotism
Value of family safety	Value of family
Value of love	Value of love
Value of responsibility	Value of responsibility
Value of courtesy	Value of kindness
Value of afterlife	Value of tolerance
Value of honesty	Value of honesty
Value of reasonableness	Value of consistency
Value of self-control	Value of maturity
Value of real friendship and benevolence	Value of sharing
Values of wisdom, intellectuality and open-mindedness	Value of intellectuality
Value of cleaning	Value of personal care
Values of pleasure and world of beauty	Value of culture

the questions were about the values that people want to have themselves, these two values could be expected to be found as well. It is a suggestion of this study to add this problem to any further study. In this way, the core values and the other expected values can be determined comparatively.

The values of interest, proper speaking, sincerity, cordiality, assertiveness, optimism, conformity, consociationalism, humility, consistency, morality, bravery, virtuousness, maturity, intelligence, and Atatürkism found in the research findings are not included in the curriculum. However, some of these values that are not included in the curriculum, such as assertiveness and proper speaking values are included in the scope of the skills.

In addition, the interest and conformity value categories included in the findings are not included in the curriculum, but they are included in the unit of human relations and communication in the ministry's 7th grade social studies course book. There are many communication values such as positive approach, kindness, lack of prejudice, listening carefully, empathizing, respecting, listening carefully, paying attention to mimic and gestures, using

open speech and not using ordering sentences while communicating in this unite (MoNE, 2016). This can be explained by the fact that the values are mostly given as top value categories in the curriculum. Whether or not other values found in the research findings take place in course books can be detected only through a detailed course book content analysis. This case also takes place within the recommendations of the study. The value of Atatürkism is included as a separate section in the curriculum. For this reason, the curriculum does not include the value of Atatürkism in the list of values.

The comparison of these categories with the six value categories in Spranger (1931, as cited in Caliskur and Aslan, 2013; Samur, 2011; Ozguven, 2003; Gungor, 1998) values assessment test is presented in Table 10. Table 10 presents the comparison of value categories. However, the value categories of maturity, culture and Atatürkism, sincerity, cordiality, optimism, responsibility, morality, and virtuousness are not found in Spranger (1931) categories.

Similarly, the values in Rokeach (1973) values inventory and its comparison with the value categories in this study are presented in Table 11. Table 11 presents

**Table 12.** Comparison of value categories in this research and Schwartz (2005) value categories.

<b>Schwartz's value categories</b>	<b>Value categories in this research</b>
Value of safety	Values of patriotism, personal care (Cleaning is listed within the context of security value in Schwartz (2005) categories) and family
Value of conformity	Value of conformity
Value of benevolence	Values of responsibility, honesty, sharing and tolerance
Value of universality	Values of peace and virtuousness
Value of conformity	Values of respect, tolerance, and kindness
Value of success	Value of intelligence
Value of self-tendency	Value of intellectuality
Value of Hedonism	Value of culture

the comparison of value categories. However, the value categories of interest, proper speech, sincerity, optimism, conformity, consociationalism, respect, humility, unifying, morality, braveness, virtuousness, intelligence, and Atatürkism are not found in Rokeach (1973) categories.

Similarly, the values in Schwartz (2005) values inventory and the comparison of it with the value categories in this study are presented in Table 12. Table 12 presents the comparison of value categories. However, the value categories of love, unifying, consistency, morality, bravery, being fair, maturity and Atatürkism related to the top value category of effective communication in this study are not listed in Schwartz (2005) list of values. The abovementioned studies, which are the main references in the literature regarding the studies on values and the differences in the value categories of this study, can be explained primarily through the differences between nations indeed, what shape societies are their historical processes. These processes make the nations different from each other in terms of their perceptions, understandings, feelings and cultures, and ideographic them. The second reason for the differences is the difference in the width and socio-demographic characteristics of the sampled groups. The abovementioned studies were conducted on larger masses with random sampling method while this study was conducted on social studies teaching students from only two universities with purpose sampling technique. The third reason for differences is the timing of the studies. The changing effect of time on human societies is inevitable, even when it has a modifying effect on matter. It is perhaps inevitable that a society is expected to exhibit different approaches in the same subject over time.

In this study, it was found that almost all of the female students and majority of the male students want to find the value of effective communication primarily in people they interact with. Effective communication is a prioritized value for both genders. This finding suggests that the students are most likely to experience communication deficiencies in their social lives. Effective communication

is a social problem. In every field, studies must be conducted to resolve this problem. The female students' preference of this value is significantly higher than that of male students. This finding can be explained by more sensitive and fragile emotional worlds of females. In addition, this finding suggests that preference intensity of some values may differ by gender. This finding is parallel with the findings of Feather (1979), Prince-Gibson and Schwartz (1998), and Schwartz and Rubel (2005), suggesting that gender is an important variable for value orientations.

Rokeach and Ball-Rokeach (1989) concluded that men are more achievement-oriented and intellectually oriented than women are. This finding is also consistent with the result of this study in the same value category. As a matter of fact, while 2.8% of female in this study gave importance to the value of intellectuality, it was 27.8% for male. On the other hand, the value of intellectuality does not have a high priority for either genders. While there is a difference between the values of effective communication and intellectuality by gender, the preference of other values does not differ by gender.

It was found that students of Marmara University rarely and students of Kafkas University partially want to find the value of unity in people they interact with. The value of unity is not very important for the students of both universities. This can be explained by the fact that there is no problem in the minds of the students related to unity.

Almost all of the students at Marmara University and majority of the students at Kafkas University, that is almost all of the students from the Western Anatolia and majority of the students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia, desire to primarily find the value of peace in people they interact with. This can be explained by the importance of peace values for students of both universities and regions.

The preference of this value by the students from Marmara University and Western Anatolia is significantly higher than other students. This result can be explained by the fact that peace values are needed socially and this

need is higher in the Western Anatolia. As a matter of fact, Western Anatolia was exposed to the influence of modernity earlier compared to the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia, and has evolved into a heterogeneous and chaotic social structure through immigrants with the individual and selfish life style of capitalist culture earlier compared to the East.

According to the result from the study, almost half of the students from the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolia and some of the students from the Western Anatolia desire to find the value of honesty in people they interact with. This can be explained with the similar assessment aforementioned. There is the greater need for honesty in the social experiences of people from the East and Southeast, and thus they are more aware of the lack of this value. However, these deficiencies will find an answer in a further study to reveal the map of Turkey's social value orientations.

## CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors have not declared any conflict of interests.

## REFERENCES

- Allport GW, Vernon PE, Lindzey G (1960). Study Of Values: A Scale For Measuring The Dominant Interests In Personality. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Akbas O (2008). Deger egitimi akimlarina genel bir bakis. Degerler egitimi dergisi. 6(16):9-27.
- Akbas O (2004). Turk milli egitim sisteminin duyussal amaclarinin ilkogretim ikinci kademedeki gerceklesme derecesinin degerlendirilmesi. (unpublished phd thesis) Gazi Universty, Institute Educatioanal Sciences, Ankara.
- Bagci I (2007). J. J. Rousseau, Emile ve cocugun sosyal egitimi. Egitim klasikleri incelemeleri (Edt. Bahri Ata ve Ikram Bagci), 31–41. Ankara: Pegem A.
- Bas V (2014). Universite ogrencilerinden degerler ve yasamin anlami arasindaki iliski (unpublished phd thesis) Necmettin Erbakan Universty, Institute Educatioanal Sciences, Konya.
- Baysal N Z, Samanci O (2010). Ilkogretim besinci sinif ogrencileri ile degerler uzerine bir calisma. Electronic J. Soc. Sci. 9(34):56-69.
- Berelson B (1952). Content analysis in communication research. New York: The Free Press.
- Boke K (2009). Coklu metot kullanimi. Sosyal bilimlerde arastirma yontemleri (ed. Kaan Boke), Istanbul: Alfa Yayinlari.
- Caliskur A, Aslan AE (2013). Rokeach degerler envanteri guvenirlik ve gecerlik arastirmasi. Balikesir University, J. Soc. Sci. Institute, 19(29):81-105.
- Cavdarci M (2002).Türkiye'de sosyal degerlerin asinmasi ve kultur somurgeciligi. (unpublished master's thesis). Suleyman Demirel University, Institute Social Sciences. Isparta.
- Celikkaya H (1999). Fonksiyonel egitim sosyolojisi. Istanbul: Alfa Yayinlari.
- Deveci H, Gultekin M, Bayir OG (2009). Cocuktan cocuga ogretim yaklasimi ile degerler egitimi. In IV. Social sciences education congress book. 1:678-687.
- Dilmac B (1999). İlköğretim ogrencilerine insani degerler egitimi verilmesi ve ahlaki olgunluk olcegi ile egitimin sinanmasi. (unpublished master's thesis). Marmara University, Institute Educational Sciences. Istanbul.
- Doganay A (2011). Degerler egitimi. (ed. Cemil Ozturk). Sosyal bilgiler ogretimi demokratik vatandaslik egitimi. Ankara: Pegem A. 225-256.
- Eksi H, Katilmis A (2011). Karakter egitimi el kitabi. Ankara: Nobel Yayin Dagitim.
- Eksi H (2003). Temel insani degerlerin kazandirilmasinda bir yaklasim: Karakter egitimi programlari. Degerler egitimi dergisi. 1(1):76 -96.
- Emre Y, Yapici A (2015). Turkish Studies - International Periodical ForThe Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic, Ankara 10(2):1489-1501.
- Feather N T (1979). Values, expectancy, and reaction. American Psychologist. 14:243-260.
- Gokce O (2006). Icerik analizi, kuramsal ve pratik bilgiler. Istanbul: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Gungor E (1998). Degerler psikolojisi uzerinde arastirmalar. Istanbul: Otuken Yayinlari.
- Guvan A, Kaya R, Akkus Z (2014). Ilkogretim 6. sinif ogrencilerinin deger algilari uzerine bir arastirma. Turkish Studies- International periodical for the languages, literature and history of turkish or turkic Ankara. 9(5):1067-1083.
- ÖSYS (2012). Announcement of Results of Placement of 2012-OSYS. Press Release. Available at: <http://www.osym.gov.tr/TR,971/2012-osys-yerlestirme-sonuclarinin-aciklanmasi-17082012.html>
- Inal K (2004). Egitim ve iktidar. Ankara: Ütopya.
- Kan C (2010). Sosyal bilgiler dersi ve degerler egitimi. Milli egitim dergisi. 187:138-145.
- Kasapoglu A (1992). Sosyoloji ogrencilerinin sosyal deger ve tutumlari, 35(1):140-158.
- Keskin Y (2016). Değer sınıflaması uzerine aksiyonel bir deneme. International periodical for the languages, literature and history of Turkish or Turkic. Ankara. 11(3):1485-1510.
- Keskin Y (2015). Tarih dersi ogretim programi ve ders kitaplarinda degerler egitimi. Turkish studies international periodical for the languages, literature and history of Turkish or Turkic. 10(7):659-674. Ankara.
- Korkmaz A (2013). Toplum bilimleri dergisi. Degerler sosyolojisi. 7(14):51-78.
- Kusdil ME, Kagitcibasi C (2000). Turk ogretmenlerin deger yönelimleri ve Schwartz deger kurami. Turk psikoloji dergisi. 15(45):59-76.
- MoNE (2016). 7. sinif sosyal bilgiler ders kitabi. Ankara: Devlet kitaplari.
- MoNE (2013). Millî egitim bakanligi ilköğretim kurumları yönetmeliği. [http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/ilkogrkuryon\\_1%5Cilkogrkuryon\\_2.html](http://mevzuat.meb.gov.tr/html/ilkogrkuryon_1%5Cilkogrkuryon_2.html) (25.04.2016).
- MoNE (2004). <http://ttkb.meb.gov.tr/program2.aspx> (25.04.2016).
- Mehmedoglu A. U. (2007). Universite ogrencilerinin deger yönelimleri ve dindarlik.
- Neumann W (2008). Toplumsal arastirma yontemleri. Istanbul: Yayin odasi.
- Ozturk C, Balci N (2009). İlköğretim altinci sinif sosyal bilgiler dersinde degerler egitiminin etkililigi, In IV. Social sciences education congress book.
- Ozguven IE (2003). Psikolojik testler, 5 th press. Ankara: Pdrem Yayinlari.
- Parsons T, Shils EA (1962). Values, Motives, and Systems of Action, T. Parsons, E. A. Shils (eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action (Fifth Printing), Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. pp. 45-275.
- Prince-Gibson E, Schwartz S H (1998). Value priorities and gender. Soc. Psychol. Q. 61(1):49-67.
- Punch FK (2005). *Sosyal arastirmalara giris nitel ve nicel yaklasimlar*. Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Rokeach M (1973). The nature of human values. New York:The Free Press.
- Rokeach M, Ball-Rokeach SJ (1989). Stability and change in american value priorities 1968-1981. American psychological association. 44(5):775-784.
- Schwartz SH, Rubel T (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: cross-cultural and multimethod studies. J. Personality and Soc. Ppsychol. 89:1010-1028.
- Schwartz SH (1992). Universal in the content and structure of values: Theory and empirical test in 20 countries. Advances in Extrimental Soc. Ppsychol. 25:1-65.
- Schwartz SH (2006). Les valeurs de base de la personne: théorie, mesures et applications. Revue Française de Sociol. 45:929-968.
- Thomas WI, Znaniecki F (1918). The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Monograph of An Immigran Group I, Boston: The Gorham

- Press.
- Yazici M (2013). Toplumsal deęisim ve sosyal deęerler. Turkish studies - international periodical for the languages, literature and history of Turkish or Turkic Ankara 8(8):1489-1501.
- Yel S, Aladag E (2009). Sosyal bilgilerde deęerlerin öğretilimi. Sosyal bilgiler öğretimi, (edt. Mustafa Safran), Ankara:Pegem Akademi. pp. 117-148.
- Yildirim A, Simsek H (2008). Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri. Ankara Seckin Yayıncılık.
- Ulusoy K, Tay B, (2011). Sosyal bilgilerde deęer eğitimi. Sosyal bilgiler öğretiminde yeni yaklaşımlar. (edit. Refik Turan, Murat Sunbul, Hakan Akdag) Ankara:Pegem Akademi.
- Zabun B, (2013). Deęerlerin sosyolojik öğretimi: ortaöğretim sosyoloji dersi öğretim programında yer alan deęerlerin analizi. Akademik bakis dergisi. 38:1-11.
- Zhang Y, Wildemuth B M (2009). Qualitative analysis of content. [http://ils.unc.edu/~yanz/Content\\_analysis.pdf](http://ils.unc.edu/~yanz/Content_analysis.pdf) (25.05.2009)