A New Value Classification and Values to Be Acquired by Students Related to This Classification[*]

M. Bahaddin ACAT
Eskişehir Osmangazi University

Mecit ASLAN[a]
Yüzüncü Yıl University

Abstract

The aim of this study is to access a new value classification and analyse the views of teacher and parents related to this classification. The general survey model was employed in this study. The population of this study is composed of school teachers working in primary schools and parents of their students in Eskişehir. The present study adopted a stratification sample, known as a purposeful sampling. The sample consists of 575 teachers and 1726 parents selected from the primary schools in Eskişehir. The Living Values Table was used to collection data. The data obtained were analysed on the computer with "SPSS for Windows, ver: 18.0" program. Signification of the analyses we made were tested at the level of .05. Hierarchical cluster analysis was used to access the value classification. A value classification composing of five classes (conservative-traditional values, national-ethnic values, self oriented-personal values, social-community values, scientific-innovative values) was obtained in the study. The scores given for conservative-traditional values and social-community values showed a statistical significance in favour of parents; the scores given for national-ethnic values, self oriented-personal values, and scientific-innovative values showed a statistical significance in favour of teachers.

The concept of value has different definitions. Because value that is a general and abstract concept is often used to express different meanings (Kuçuradi, 2010). Value derived from "valere" a Latin word means "adopted, admired, overrated and upheld thing" or "a thing which is important and valid for human" (Aydın, 2003; Timüçin, 1994; Yıldırım, 2007). The value can be defined as "a fact believed, desired and used as a scale" or "as a belief shows individual and social preferences" (Akbaba-Altun, 2003; Aydın; Oktay, 2007).

* This study was presented at the Values Education Symposium, October 26–28, 2011, Eskisehir Osmangazi University, Eskişehir, Turkey.

a **Mecit ASLAN** is currently a research assistant at the Department of Educational Sciences, Curriculum and Instruction. His research interests include SPSS applications, values education, character education and qualifications of instructors. Correspondence: Mecit ASLAN, Yuzuncu Yil University, Faculty of Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Van/Turkey.
E-mail: maslan4773@gmail.com
Phone: +90 432 225 1024/1766.

Many definitions of value have been made by researchers and different value classifications have been made. This shows there is not any classification accepted by everyone (Aslan, 2011; Peterson, 1970). Lickona (1991) expressed the values as moral and non-moral. Additionally, values were classified as instrumental and terminal by Rokeach, as theoretical, utilitarian, aesthetic, social, individualistic and traditional by Spranger and as power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security and super-grouping by Schwartz (Akbaş, 2004; Atay, 2003; Güngör, 2000; İşcan, 2007; Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Schwartz, 1992; Yazıcı, 2006).

Values education is a value development process. An important question in values education is that which values should be taught (Dale, 1994; Lickona, 1993; Superka, Ahrens, Hedstrom, Ford, & Johnson, 1976). There is no universal answer of this question. The more accepted answer is that views of students, teachers, parents and the other partners should be taken to determine the values taught in schools. The family has an important role in values

education (Brynildssen 2002; *Özensel*, 2003; Vess & Halbur 2003). Important task of the schools is to teach values, to discipline students and to contribute to moral and character development (Akbaş, 2007). Both the school and parents are required to put more effort than before. Because factors which affect the child's values system are diversified (Gömleksiz, 2007).

Purpose

There are two aims of this study. The first aim is to access a new and comprehensive value classification. The second is to analyse the views of teachers and parents related to this classification.

Method

The general survey model has been employed in the study. General survey model designs to be administered on an entire population, a group selected from the whole population, sample or sampling in order to make a general judgment about the population consisting of many items (Karasar, 2004). The population of this study composed of school teachers working in primary schools and parents of their students in Eskişehir. The present study has adopted a stratification sample, known as a purposeful sampling. The sample consists of 575 teachers and 1726 parents selected from the primary schools in Eskişehir. The Living Values Table has been used to collect data. The data obtained have been analysed on the computer with "SPSS for Windows, ver: 18.0" program. Signification of the analyses we have made has been tested at the level of .05. Hierarchical cluster analysis (Çokluk, Şekercioğlu, & Büyüköztürk, 2010) has been used to access the value classification.

Results

As a result of Ward's Connection (minimum variance) Method, a value classification including five classes and 56 values has been obtained. There are 16 values in the first class named "conservative-traditional values", 6 values in the second class named "national-ethnic values", 7 values in the third class "self oriented-personal values", 13 values in the fourth class named "social-community values" and 14 values in the fifth class in "scientific-innovative values".

The teachers have given more points to "national-ethnic values", "self oriented-personal values" and "scientific-innovative values" than parents have, but the parents have given more points to "conservative-traditional values" and "social-community values". The difference between the scores given for all classes has showed a statistical significance in terms of the "status of being a teacher or parent" *(p<.05).*

The difference between the scores given for "national-ethnic values", "social-community values" and "scientific-innovative values" has showed a statistical significance in terms of "gender of the teachers" *(p<.05).* However, no such significance can be determined between the scores given for "conservative-traditional values" and "self oriented-personal values" *(p>.05).*

The difference between the scores given for "conservative-traditional values" and "national-ethnic values" has showed a statistical significance in terms of "branch of the teachers" *(p<.05).* However, no such significance can be determined between the scores given for "social-community values", "scientific-innovative values" and "self oriented-personal values" *(p>.05).*

The difference between the scores given by parents for all classes has shown a statistical significance in terms of "location of school" *(p<.05).*

The difference between the scores given by parents for "self oriented-personal values" and "social-community values" has showed a statistical significance in terms of "education level of parents" *(p<.05).* However, no such significance can be determined between the scores given for all the other three classes *(p>.05).*

Discussion and Conclusion

At the end of the study, as a result of hierarchical cluster analysis, a value classification including five classes (conservative-traditional values, national-ethnic values, self oriented-personal values, social-community values and scientific-innovative values) have been reached. In the classification done by Schwartz, religious values were reached under the tradition class (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000; Schwartz, 1992; Yazıcı, 2006). In our classification religious values were under the conservative-traditional values class, too. In addition to, our classification is similar to Schwartz's in self-oriented-personal values class. In Sprenger classification, social values include values regulating social and individual relationships like ours (Akbaş, 2004; Güngör, 2000; Yazıcı, 2006). In short, classification we have reached is similar to other classification in some aspects. However, the scope of the classifica-

tion and its classes make it different from the others. As the result of their study, Yiğittir and Öcal (2010) expressed that value classifications were not very functional.

The difference between the scores given for all classes has showed a statistical significance in terms of the "status of being a teacher or parent". This difference is in favour of teachers in "national-ethnic values", "self oriented-personal values" and "scientific-innovative values" classes and is in favour of parents in "conservative-traditional values" and "social-community values" classes. Based on these findings, we can conclude that the parents prefer more consistent and conservative children, while the teachers prefer more self-oriented and sensitive to national values.

The difference between the scores given for "national-ethnic values", "social-community values" and "scientific-innovative values" has showed a statistical significance in terms of "gender of the teachers". This difference is in favour of women in "national-ethnic values" and "scientific-innovative values" classes and is in favour of men in "social-community values" class. These findings are consistent with literature studies (Bacanlı, 2002; Sarı, 2005).

The difference between the scores given by parents for all classes has showed a statistical significance in terms of "location of school". This difference is in favour of neighbourhoods in high socio-economic level in the city centre in "national-ethnic values", "self oriented-personal values" classes and is in favour of village in "conservative-traditional values" and "social-community values" classes.

References/Kaynakça

Akbaba-Altun, S. (2003). Eğitim yönetimi ve değerler. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1 (1), 7-18.

Akbaş, O. (2004). *Türk milli eğitim sisteminin duyuşsal amaçlarının (değerlerinin) ilköğretim II. kademedeki gerçekleşme derecesinin değerlendirilmesi*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Aslan, M. (2011). İlköğretimde karakter eğitimi ve öğrencilere kazandırılması gereken değerler. Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.

Atay, S. (2003). Türk yönetici adaylarının siyasal ve dini tercihleri ile yasam değerleri arasındaki ilişki. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1 (3), 87-120.

Aydın, M. (2003). Gençliğin değer algısı: Konya örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1 (3), 121-144.

Bacanlı, H. (2002). *Psikolojik kavram analizleri*. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Brynildssen, S. (2002). *Character education through children's literature*. Bloomington IN.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading English and Communication, Family Learning Association.

Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G. ve Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: SPSS ve LISREL uygulamaları*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Dale, N. T. (1994). *Values education in American secondary school* [Online]. Education Conference, Kutztown University, Kutztown. Retrieved 10 January 2005, from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2sql/content_storage_01/0000019b/ 80/13/d0/ 2b.pdf

Gömleksiz, M. N. (2007, Kasım). *Lise öğrencilerinin toplumsal değerlere ilişkin tutumları: Elazığ ili örneği*. Değerler ve Eğitimi Uluslararası Sempozyumu'nda sunulan bildiri, DEM, İstanbul.

Güngör, E. (2000). *Değerler psikolojisi üzerine araştırmalar*. İstanbul: Ötüken yayınları.

İşcan, C. D. (2007). İlköğretim düzeyinde değerler eğitimi programının etkililiği. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Karasar, N. (2004). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kuçuradi, İ. (2010). İnsan ve değerleri. Ankara: Türkiye Felsefe Kurumu.

Kuşdil, M. E. ve Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerinin değer yönelimleri ve Scwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 45*, 59-76.

Lickona, T. (1991). *Educating for Character: How our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. Newyork: Bantam Books.

Lickona, T. (1993). The return of character education. *Educational Leadership*, 51 (3), 6-11.

Oktay, A. S. (2007, Kasım). *İslam düşüncesinde ahlâki değerler ve bunların global ahlâka etkileri*. Değerler ve Eğitimi Uluslararası Sempozyumu'nda sunulan bildiri, DEM, İstanbul.

Özensel, E. (2003). Sosyolojik bir olgu olarak değer. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 1* (3), 217-239.

Peterson, J. A. (1970). *Counseling and values*. Scranton: International Textbook Company.

Sarı, E. (2005). Öğretmen adaylarının değer tercihleri: Giresun eğitim fakültesi örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi, 3* (10), 73-88.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and emprical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 25*, 1-65.

Superka, D. P., Ahrens, C., Hedstrom, J. E., Ford, L. J., & Johnson, P. L. (1976). *Values education sourcebook: conceptual approaches, material analyses, and an annotated bibliography*. Colorado: Social Science Education Consortuim, ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/ Social Science Education.

Timüçin, A. (1994). *Felsefe sözlüğü*. İstanbul: BDS Yayınları.

Vess, K. A., & Halbur, D. A. (2003). Character education: what counselor educators need to know. *ERIC/CASS Digest*.

Yazıcı, K. (2006). Değerler eğitimine genel bir bakış. *Türklük Bilimi Araştırmaları, 19*, 499-522.

Yıldırım, G. (2007). *İlköğretim düzeyinde bir karakter eğitimi programı model önerisi ve uygulanabilirliği*. Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara Üniversitesi, Eğitimi Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Yiğittir, S. ve Öcal, A. (2010). İlköğretim 6. sınıf öğrencilerinin değer yönelimleri. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 24*, 407-416.