

A Comparison between Turkish and British Students' Acquisition Levels of Universal-Social Values Placed in Curriculum: A Case Study

Yakup Keskin

*Theology Faculty, Primary School Religious and Moral Studies Department,
Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, 55200, Turkey
E-mail: ykeskin@omu.edu.tr*

KEYWORDS Universal Values. Value Acquisition Level. Value Education. Primary Curriculum. Comparison

ABSTRACT In 2005 by reforming its primary school curriculum Turkey has introduced a set of regarding methods of acquiring and teaching national spiritual cultural and international values. Considered within the contexts of Turkey's EU bid and globalization, acquisition of moral values bears importance for the national education system of Turkey. By comparing Turkey to the UK this project aims to present the level of acquiring some of the international values "*respect, tolerance, protecting and developing cultural values*" that are included in the curriculum (Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge, Social Studies, Humanities Course) of various countries, as well as Turkey. The Project involves the following process: literature review, analysis of the primary curriculum of both countries, development of measuring methods, application of the forms of measurement, observation of the mutual visits and evaluation of research findings. Students of 11-12 age group attending primary schools in Turkey and the UK are studied in this research. Within the research, the measurement of value levels was adopted into English. Using nonparametric analysis techniques the data was analyzed. The analysis was carried out both within each country and by comparing both countries.

INTRODUCTION

Moral corruption and depreciation in certain societies has spread throughout the world as a result of globalization. People created problems in some societies and gradually these have led to larger global concerns (Koylu 2006). Many would argue that humanity expects some acquisitions from 21st century in education such as peace, liberty, achievement, and realization of social justice. Therefore many national or global organizations work to make human values a priority in order to sustain freedom, peace, equality, tolerance, love, solidarity, sensitivity, honesty, and respect (Buyukduvenci 2009). Territories in many countries embrace cultural differences such as language and faith so that they can become pluralist societies; moreover, in this context, people with different beliefs and backgrounds must learn to live together (Hill 1998). Young people are adversely affected by increasing violence, social conditioning, and immorality. Incompatibility between the school and education is another factor that affects this situation (Seshadri 2005).

It is believed, therefore, that the implementation of programs that are geared towards enhancing the awareness of universal values are

effective in solving problems in society and educational systems such as inequality, violence, lack of love and respect. As a result, individuals and groups cannot understand each other (El-Hassan and Kahil 2005). This adds strength to the argument of the importance of the value education in creating well-functioning and functioning democratic social structure.

Education has two primary functions: to raise intelligence and to raise moral character (Lickona 1993). Due to the fact that the oldest mission of schools has been to make students acquire values, the value education in schools naturally will continue as long as there are schools (Ryan 1993).

Value

Value, according to the Turkish Language Institution, *is an abstract level of the importance of a thing, and corresponds to its worth* (TDK 1983). 'Value', which comes from the root of the "Valere" in Latin, means "to be valuable" or "be strong", and it has been suggested that this word has been transferred to ethics when formerly used in the field of economics (Kucuradi 1971). Znaniecki passed by it in the social sciences (Bilgin 1995). Naturally, due to the fact

that the social scientists have focused on the value and the studies concentrated on the values, from philosophy to sociology, education, and in the behavioral science discipline, many looked at this concept in its incidence angle (Demircioglu and Tokdemir 2008).

The values are preferred for the purposes of life directions, a particular form of behavior or purpose in life as an ongoing belief (Rokeach 1973), a set of guidelines for thoughts and actions (Feather 1975), and standards for human life, which serves and is desired for cases beyond goals (Schwartz 1996) or in a way that they are our life goals (Gungor 1998). Hokelekli and Gunduz (2007) characterize values as “the criteria used in the evaluation of individuals and events including themselves for directing and determining the behavior humans, the certain concrete conditions and objects exceeding the upper-level concepts or general principles that help individuals in achieving the right decisions that expresses the ideal and desirable behavior and ways of life”. This comprehensive definition adds value to this paper and to the existing body of knowledge.

Turkish National Ministry of Education defined value as the common thought, the basic moral principles or beliefs that were considered accurate and necessary by the majority of members in order to maintain the society's or a social group's existence, unity, functioning and continuity in the curriculum and the basic functions of the values are considered as the unifying aspects of society and individuals. In order to meet social needs, improve their behavior in a positive way to serve the well-being of individuals (MEB 2009b).

Although societies and individuals have different values, some have the same features in terms of structure, logic, and functionality (Yesil and Aydin 2007). Values are not independent from each other. A value affects another value and is affected as well. For example, the values such as love, respect, tolerance and benevolence cannot be considered separately. Separation of values is also very difficult. For this reason, in order gain a better understanding, values can be classified according to their functions and some of their properties. The values have different classifications in the literature Spranger (1928), Rokeach (1973), Schwartz (1992), Kilby (1993), Fichter (1996), Kahle's (1986) List of Value, (Daghfous et al. 1999).

Values such as justice, equality, and respect for human beings accepted by the majority of societies are described as universal values, while the values that are unique to a given society such as nation, state, country, language, religion, the national anthem and the national flag are considered as national values (Gomleksiz and Curo 2001; Dogan 2001; Evin and Kafadar 2004; Deveci and Dal 2006). Universal values guide a person's actions in a beneficial way in his/her relationship with himself/herself or with outsiders. The universality of the actions advocated are the product of the social system that contain all the experiences until that moment and are able to represent the people's general understanding (Koc 2007).

Values in Turkish Education System and Related Research

Objectives determined by the Turkish National Education stated its purpose as; *students adopt the Turkish nation's national, moral, humanitarian, spiritual and cultural values, protect and develop as citizens* (National Education Basic Law, No. 1739, 1973). Values were either covered as in distinct sections or spread into the program's overall aims, objectives and acquisitions in the courses such as Social Studies, Turkish, Social Studies, Science and Technology, Thinking Education, Citizenship and Democracy Education, and especially Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge, in primary school that has started to be applied in the academic year of 2004-2005 (MEB 2009a, b, c).

'Love, respect, fairness, peace, tolerance, helpfulness, patriotism and honesty' are drawn to attention as the common values of primary school programs. Correspondingly as class-specific, *'Sociality'* informs the curriculum of Social Science; *'appreciation, contentment, compassion, and generosity'* inform Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge; *'dignity, and equality'* inform Citizenship and Democracy Education curriculum (MEB 2009a, b, c; MEB 2010).

In an overall evaluation of the handling of values in primary education program:

Teaching Religious Culture and Moral Knowledge courses (RCMK) in primary education (2 hours per week) and secondary education (1 hour) is a constitutional necessity. First of all, in the RCMK Course (4-8th Classes) Curriculum Program Entrance, humanity, ideas, free-

dom, moral and cultural heritage, and respect were pointed out in religious teaching. The Program aims to cultivate virtuous students who know moral values and respect, to help them internalize moral values, to participate in their religious knowledge of universal values, and to be conscious of the fact that universal human values overlap with the human values of Islam. The RCMK Curriculum aims to teach the relationship between the religious-moral and the field of "moral" learning, the importance of national, moral and religious values in personal development and social peace, the rights and freedoms to live in peace as an honest and trustworthy human being, and forgiveness. RCMK Education program hosts 61 values, which is the highest number of values in a program, and there are 30 specific values to this program (MEB 2010). The information about approaches, methods and techniques that must be considered during the learning process is given in the "Teacher Notes" section in the teaching of religion and values (MEB 2010). Students are expected to acquire 134 sub acquisitions with a targeted 15 values as determined in the Social Science program (MEB 2009a). The target acquisition of the values has been listed under the heading of "Personal Attributes" in the program (MEB 2009a). The values were shared at the first level of the RCMK, Social Studies, Science, and Turkish programs except the targeted values of "conservation and development of the cultural values, sociality and openness to innovation". Unlike the other programs in elementary schools, the values were discussed within their own scopes of the Social Science program (MEB 2009a). As can be seen, the values of the Turkish

Language Education Program have been involved in a disguised manner (MEB 2009c). *The Social Studies* curriculum has a total of twenty-values, in spite of the specification of one value in each of these units, the program does not adequately mention what kind of achievements and activities should be conducted to acquire these values and how to assess them (MEB 2009b).

Between 2000-2011, a total of 157 master's and doctorate theses; in this area were published. Research in this area has increased dramatically especially since 2007. Nearly 60% of the master's degree theses on the values were conducted by Educational Sciences and 10% was

in the Religious Studies departments (Adiguzel and Ergunay 2012). Of the graduate theses examined between 2000-2011, ten master's degrees, two doctorate degree research of the 157 thesis examines the values in educational programs, seven master's degree thesis examines the values seen in textbooks (Adiguzel and Ergunay 2012).

Values in the UK Curriculum

The United Kingdom experienced many changes in the last 40 years, particularly at the primary education level within the scope of restructuring. The Department for Education and Skills (DfES) is responsible for educational services in the UK, the education law which came to be in 1988, is a national education program for students between the ages of 5-16 (UK Legislation 2012). Values and goals are not placed in the curriculum and have been taken place in current curriculum by the National Curriculum, Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) made by the examination of the existing curricula of other countries of the curriculum between 1996 and 1999 (Shuayb 2008). The objectives and values are more clearly stated in the curriculum which was prepared in 1999 (Department for Education 2012a). Besides the targeting of literacy, numeracy, and increase of student success in the fields of science; the curriculum's support for promoting the development of the pupils' spiritual, moral, social aspects, and taking the responsibility to prepare for life has come forward (Department for Education 2012a). The national program has been revised and renovated in 2000. Courses in the UK National Teaching Program (The National Curriculum) were determined by the core and basic fields (National Curriculum Online 2012; Eurydice 2012).

The UK's DFES will present for the program and primary schools designated standards which are not only based on student's education but also for fun and are intended to meet student's individual needs (Department for Education 2012b). This program is responsible for preparing experiences and opportunities for adult life and providing the spiritual, moral, cultural, mental and physical development of the students in the community and schools (Department for Education 2012c). Primary objectives of the programs developed in the UK between the years 2000-2006 increasingly emphasize citizenship

education and raising the standard of multiculturalism, fun for the students, the student participation process, safety, healthy nourishment and lifestyle, and sustainable development (Shuayb 2008; Hall and Ozerk 2008).

A number of initiatives have been developed to this end including the Primary Behavior and Attendance Pilot which took place from 2003 to 2005. The pilot had four strands: a universal element providing professional development opportunities to all schools in the pilot authorities (the CPD strand); a targeted element providing focused support to schools where behavior and attendance had been identified as key issues (the school improvement strand); a universal element providing curriculum work focusing on the social and emotional aspects of learning for all children in pilot schools (the curriculum materials or SEAL strand); and a targeted element providing group work for children needing extra help in this area, and their parents/caregivers (the small group interventions strand). Perhaps the most important one is the study of The Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) program (Hallam 2009). SEAL, designed to develop children's social, emotional and behavioral skills in the primary school, as part of the Primary Behavior and Attendance Pilot funded by the then Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and piloted in 25 Local Authorities in the UK. SEAL is a school-based approach to developing children's social and emotional skills. It was launched by the government in 2005 and has been adopted by schools across the UK (Hallam 2009; Otter 2010; Humphrey et al. 2008).

The Primary SEAL resource aims to provide teachers with a structured whole-school curriculum framework for developing children's social, emotional and behavioral skills (Department for Education 2012d). It is organized into six themes, each designed to last half a term, and each targeting different skills: New Beginnings (focusing mainly on empathy), Getting On and Falling Out (managing feelings), Going for Goals (motivation), Good to be Me (self-awareness and managing feelings), Relationships (self-awareness and managing feelings) and Changes (motivation and social skills). There is also a shorter theme, Say No to Bullying, which is designed to tie into Anti-Bullying Week. Definitions of the five social and emotional skills promoted through SEAL: Empathy, Self-awareness, Self-regulation (managing feelings), Motivation, Empathy (un-

derstanding others' thoughts and feelings and valuing and supporting others), and Social skills (Department for Education 2012d; National Archives 2012a).

The school, in developing their own approach, was also able to build on the ideas from the SEAL materials produced by the DfES, which worked very effectively in collaboration with a Values focus. These recognize and work on those 'underpinning qualities and skills that help us manage life and learning effectively' such as self-awareness, managing feelings, motivation, empathy and social skills (Hallam 2009). SEAL is not compulsory, but is recommended to schools in a similar way to the National Strategies for literacy and numeracy; schools can provide for children as they see fit, but must show how this meets key government-determined outcomes (Department for Education 2012e). All teachers at the school are expected to implement the SEAL program that has an important role in the development of social and emotional learning (Department for Education 2012d; Otter 2010).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Sample and Procedure

Educational research comparing countries enables us to conjecture the probable consequences of educational reforms based on the experiences of different countries, and it provides us with the accumulation of knowledge enabling us to be aware of different practices. It also plays an important and supportive role in developing educational reforms; helps encourage cross-country cooperation between nations by discussing cultural differences and similarities (Philips and Schweisfurth 2008). One of the most widely-used approaches in comparative educational researches is problem solving approach by which a problematic educational area is often chosen and a systematic analysis is carried out is to find a solution to the problem. The case study approach emphasizes that the educational experience of different countries might be useful for countries having similar circumstances (Ultanir 2000). Especially in a period of unification with the EU when several changes are being implemented in the teaching-learning approaches, comparative education might prove to be a domain which can provide with vital contributions (Erdogan 2000).

With its multicultural nature and relatively advanced economy, along with its society observant of customs and religions, England is one of the most outstanding countries in this sense. England has also scored above average among OECD countries in terms of mathematics and science literacy (Kirsch et al 2002). It is a fact that England, concentrating on priorities such as enhancing citizenship education, value education, multiculturalism in the primary school curriculums developed since 2000's and with the projects carried out by local authorities between 2003-2005, it has achieved a great deal in terms of values and values education (Hallam 2009; Otter 2010). For these reasons United Kingdom has been chosen as an ideal country to compare with Turkey.

It has also been found out that only in a limited number of studies on values, the target population has been students. Taking into consideration the fact that in Turkey there are a lot of regional differences and the society is composed of several different socio-cultural units, it is clear that students' acquisition levels of values have to be thoroughly studied (Adiguzel and Ergunay 2012). For this reason, this study is trying to put forward in a comparative way the acquisition levels of some universal values (such as *protecting and developing cultural values, tolerance, respect*) which takes place in many countries' curriculums as well as in the the Turkish Ministry of National Education's curriculums related to subjects matters such as Religious and Moral Studies, Social Studies, Turkish Life Studies by taking into consideration the socio-economic standards and gender variables of year 5 students in Samsun/Turkey and Lancaster/England. It is thought that the data obtained through this comparative study will provide a new resource for future researches on value education and that situation assessment will help develop and sustain new learning-teaching processes for primary school curriculums (Cucen 2001; Veugelers 2000).

The aforementioned research has been supported in the scope of OMU Scientific Research Projects (PYO. EGF.1907.10.001). The project initiated by researcher has been jointly carried out by the participation of OMU Education Faculty and Cumbria University Education Faculty and the related agreement documents have been approved by the universities. Four academic members along with three post-graduate stu-

dents from OMU and three academic members from Cumbria University Education Faculty have taken part in the project.

The three project partners who are also academic members from Cumbria University along with our project team have applied the *Data Instrument for Evaluating Value Acquisition Level* between 9-13 May 2011 in the schools in Samsun which have been chosen as sampling units. Five academic members in our project team, along with the project partners, have applied the English version of our *Data Instrument for Evaluating Value Acquisition Level* between 13-21 June 2011 in the primary schools in Lancaster which have been chosen as sampling units.

Research population consists of students in Samsun, Turkey, and in Lancaster, England. Research sampling consists of year five students in above-mentioned provinces (between the ages of 11 and 12) finalizing their primary education and chosen from research population by typical case sampling and purposeful sampling method of non-random sampling approach. Research sampling includes 419 students from 8 different primary schools in Samsun and 422 students from 10 different primary schools in Lancaster chosen from research population by means of maximum diversity.

As the research aims to put forward an existing case, situation or state the screening model has been used to work with (McMillan 2000). By bringing to light the characteristics being studied of the group of people constituting the research population as they are (Arseven 1994), exceptions and variables of the specific situation can be defined and compared with each other (Cohen et al 2000).

SES which is defined as social and economic status in which a group of people inhabit (Oguzkan 1981) is also about cultural elements of that domain at the same time. In general SES is supposed to include many variables such as social circle, career, income, accommodation etc. (Bacanli 1995). SES is essentially divided into three socio-economic sub-categories (high, average and low) (Tezcan 1997). In determining the basic variable of the research (SES), primary schools have been classified according to their locations and student profiles. In this context, orientation and data have been based upon and provided by Samsun Provincial Directorate of National Education, Lancashire County Council along with academic members from Cumbria University.

Data Gathering Instruments

Research data have been obtained through questionnaires carried out in research population. A questionnaire is a data collection technique in which participants express their views in writing (Arseven 1994). In this research a likert type scaling instrument developed by the project team headed, project head has been used in order to find out participants' views and opinions.

In the research "data instrument for finding out value level" has been used as an instrument for data collection. In the research scope, the values of "*respect, tolerance, protecting and developing cultural values*" have been chosen from among values included in primary school curriculums. They have done so because they have universal aspects and they are prioritized by the United Nations for world peace, and that Living Values Education Organization, along with UNICEF, considers them to be highly important in order to implement a democratic culture.

While interpreting the gathered data related to each specified value Turkish primary school curriculums have been referred in many places. The desired common targets, attitudes and behaviors related to values being researched have been chosen from among the primary school curriculums of Primary School Religious and Moral Studies along with Life Studies, Social Studies and Turkish. In order to prevent participants from giving stereotypical answers some of the items have negative statements (Tavsançil 2002). While creating the measuring instrument items, each item has been quoted from curriculums' guide books and especially that of Life Studies in which target gains are specified in a more detailed way. Respect and tolerance, two of the values being researched in the scope of this research, are chosen from both years 4 and 5 of Primary School Religious and Moral Studies while protecting cultural values (sensitivity for historical heritage) are chosen from year 5 curriculums of Primary School Religious and Moral Studies and of Life Studies.

Developing "Data Tool for Finding out Value Acquisition Level"

Stage 1: An item pool related to the *data tool for finding out (some) values* has been pre-

pared which includes 56 items related to the values such as "tolerance, respect, protecting and developing cultural values" in primary school curriculum; and a team of specialists consisting of two academics from Primary School Religious and Moral Studies Department, two academics from Curriculum and Teaching Department, one academic from Educational Evaluation and Assessment Department, two academics from Primary School Teaching Department along with three state-employed teachers doing their post-graduate studies. They have all been referred for their opinions. They have expressed their opinions under three headings: "Adequate", "Needs Amendment" and "Inadequate". Secondly, 24 specialists' opinions have been taken with options "suitable, needs correction or should be taken out" regarding the accuracy and suitability of sentences prepared for evaluating the above-mentioned values' acquisition levels. According to specialists' opinions, some expressions have been amended and nine items have been taken out, so the data gathering tool consisted of 47 items.

Stage 2: In order to test the reliability and validity of data gathering tool consisting of 47 items in terms of its internal consistency, it has been applied as a pre-trial in a year five class of a primary school which was not in the scope of research and which had middle socio-economic level. During the pre-trial test the suitability of assessment tool to the conceptual framework along with its structural validity have been reviewed in order to make the scale structure more meaningful (Buyukozturk 2007).

Stage 3: At this stage as a result of pre-trial and reliability analysis, 26 questions whose 'p' value was meaningless and whose distinguishing characters were below 20 points have been eliminated, reducing the number of items to 21.

The Cronbach Alpha coefficient has been calculated in relation to the reliability of the scale. The value of KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) has been found to be 86 and as this value is greater than 50, it was decided that the scale tool was suitable for data set factor analysis. In the factor analysis carried out, the scores obtained actualized the conditions of normal dispersion requirements and did not have multiple connection problems. It has been found that nine factor' Eigen values were more than 1 and that these factors explained the 61.687% of total variance. Nevertheless the assessment instrument pre-

pared through three basic values sampled out of primary school curriculum did not match up with the number of factors obtained. So the factor rotation has been carried out in order to obtain factors which can be named and interpreted. At the end of rotation analysis 6 factors have been obtained and it has been found out that these factors were not compatible with the item groups constituting those three target values. Therefore, the item groups belonging to three values taking place in the assessment instrument have been grouped together as they are grouped in the primary school curriculum. The items related to values have been assessed by analyzing them with each other.

Stage 4: At the end of reliability and validity controls, the findings obtained have been thoroughly examined and the data gathering instrument consisting of 21 items has been shaped accordingly. The scale has been finalized in the type of quintet likert scale as “*strongly disagree, disagree, uncertain, agree and strongly agree*”.

Stage 5: The English version of the assessment instrument for pretest application has also been prepared by taking into account the educational specialists' opinions and scale development process requirements. We have got in touch with the project partners, academics from Cumbria University through social media for thirteen times. The necessary amendments and arrangements of the English version arising from cultural, religious, national differences of the project partners have been carried out by the project partners in the preparatory stage. Cumbria University Ethical Committee has issued the ethical report on the assessment instrument stating that it was applicable. The English version of assessment instrument has been reviewed by the researchers in the project and they have decided that 21 items out of the assessment instrument can be comparable between the two countries. 21 item roots related to the values *tolerance, respect, protecting and developing cultural values* constituting the scope of research have been chosen to make comparison between the two countries.

Stage 6 Application: The project partners, academics from Cumbria University along with our project team have applied the “data tool for finding out value acquisition level” between 9 - 13 May 2011 in the primary schools in Samsun designated as sampling units. Our project teams (five researchers) along with the project part-

ners have applied the English version of “data tool for finding out value acquisition level” between 13–21 June 2011 in the schools in Lancaster designated as sampling units.

Data Analysis

The data obtained in this way has been analyzed using non-parametric data analysis methods. Analysis has been provided in a comparative way both between and within countries. The data gathered by means of “data tool for finding out value acquisition level” has been transferred to computer environment and electronically analyzed. The chi-square test along with Mann-Whitney U tests have also been used in addition to frequency and percentage method in data analysis.

RESULTS

This study is putting forward the acquisition methods and levels of some universal values (personal characteristics and skills) to be acquired by pupils within the framework of the new curriculum implemented in primary schools starting from 2005-2006 academic year in a comparative way between England and Turkey. The data obtained in this context is given in Table 1.

The research sampling consists of a total of 419 students attending 8 different primary schools in Samsun province; 53% (n = 222) of which is male students, 45.3% (n=190) of which is female students, 1.7% (n=7) of which is students not specifying their genders. From the point of view of (SES), it is seen that 28.2 % (n=118) of students' families has low income level, 40.8% (n=171) has of students' families has average income level while 31% of students' families has low income level. The research sampling also consists of a total of 422 students attending 10 different primary schools in Sam-

Table 1: Results of the descriptive analysis related to students participating in the research

Country	Gender			Total (N)
	Male (N)	Female (N)	Unanswered (N)	
Turkey	222	190	7	419
England	184	226	12	422
Total	406	416	19	841

sun province; 43.6% (n = 184) of which is male students, 53.6% (n=226) of which is female students, 2.8% (n=7) of which is students not specifying their genders. From the point of view of (SES), it is seen that 40.5 % (n=171) of students' families has low income level, 45.5% (n=190) has of students' families has average income level while 14.5 % (n=61) of students' families has low income level.

Analysis of Items Related to Cultural Values

Items related to acquisition of common cultural values taking place in the teaching programs of Turkey and England are compared between two countries in Table 2. It is seen that the acquisition level of seven items vary according to the country variable ($p < .05$). Regarding the mean ranking order of these items, it is seen that for the items other than "If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the old ones" the meaning order of Turkish students is higher than English students. Regarding the mean ranking order belonging to the item "If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the old ones" it is seen that English students have higher points than Turkish students and more British students would like new buildings in their neighborhood compared to Turkish students. As a result of these findings, it can be said that Turkish students' general acquisition level of values in the teaching programs is higher than that of British students.

Cultural Values in Genders

As Table 3 indicates that when items related to value acquisition are compared between two countries all seven items' rankings vary between the two countries for both male and female students ($p \leq .05$). It is seen that while the mean rank order of Turkish female students is higher than that of their British students concerning the items, "If we do our duty as citizens we support our country; When I go to a city, I want to visit the city's museum and historical places; I think of my town or village as my home; I wish our national holidays were celebrated in other countries; Historical places are what our ancestors have left us to care for.", the mean ranking order of British students is higher than that of Turkish students concerning the item "If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the old ones". When male and female students are evaluated separately regarding these results, the acquisition level of cultural values among Turkish students is higher than British students.

Cultural Values at Different Socio-economic Levels

When items related to acquisition of cultural values are compared between the countries considering socio-economic standards as shown in Table 4; regarding the mean rank order belonging to students of low socio-economic stan-

Table 2: General comparative analysis of values between countries

No.	Items	Country	N	Mean rank points	Total rank points	U	Z	P
1	If we do our duty as citizens we support our country.	UK	422	360.98	151332.5	63079.5	-7.92	.00
		TR	419	481.45	201728.5			
		Total	841					
2	When I go to a city, I want to visit the city's museum and historical places.	UK	422	322.36	136034.0	46781.0	-12.27	.00
		TR	419	520.35	218027.0			
		Total	841					
3	I think of my town or village as my home.	UK	422	383.94	162024.5	72771.50	-4.97	.00
		TR	419	458.32	192036.5			
		Total	841					
4	If I could, I would build new buildings to replace	UK	422	500.54	211228.0	54843.0	-9.798	.00
		TR	419	340.89	142833.0			
		Total	841					
5	I wish our national holidays were celebrated	UK	422	380.73	160668.5	71415.50	-4.987	.00
		TR	419	461.56	193392.5			
		Total	841					
6	Historical places are what our ancestors have left us to care for.	UK	422	316.63	133619.0	44366.0	13.64	.00
		TR	419	526.11	220442.0			
		Total	841					

Table 3: Cultural values in genders

	Items	Country	N	Mean rank points	Total rank points	U	Z	P
Male	If we do our duty as citizens we support our	UK	184	170.60	31391.00	14371.0	-5.78	.00
		TR	222	230.77	51230.00			
		Total	406					
	When I go to a city, I want to visit the city's museum	UK	184	153.50	28244.50	11224.5	-8.08	.00
		TR	222	244.94	54376.50			
		Total	406					
	I think of my town or village as my home.	UK	184	183.29	33725.50	16705.50	-3.55	.00
		TR	222	220.25	48895.50			
		Total	406					
	If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the	UK	184	249.86	45974.50	11893.50	-7.47	.00
		TR	222	165.07	36646.50			
		Total	406					
Female	I wish our national holidays were celebrated in other	UK	184	189.44	34857.00	17837.0	-2.27	.02
		TR	222	215.15	47764.00			
		Total	406					
	Historical places are what our ancestors have left us	UK	184	150.20	27636.50	10616.50	-9.21	.00
		TR	222	247.68	54984.50			
		Total	406					
	If we do our duty as citizens we support our country.	UK	226	184.41	41677.50	16026.50	-4.83	.00
		TR	190	237.15	45058.50			
		Total	416					
	When I go to a city, I want to visit the city's museum	UK	226	159.69	36090.50	10439.50	-9.44	.00
		TR	190	266.56	50645.50			
		Total	416					
	I think of my town or village as my home.	UK	226	192.03	43399.00	17748.00	-3.40	.00
		TR	190	228.09	43337.00			
		Total	416					
	If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the	UK	226	240.98	54460.50	14130.50	-6.16	.00
		TR	190	169.87	32275.50			
		Total	416					
	I wish our national holidays were celebrated in other	UK	226	183.25	41414.00	15763.00	-4.83	.00
		TR	190	238.54	45322.00			
		Total	416					
	Historical places are what our ancestors have left us	UK	226	161.13	36415.00	10764.00	-9.50	.00
		TR	190	264.85	50321.00			
		Total	416					

dards, it is seen that the acquisition level of items other than the item "If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the old ones" is higher among Turkish students and that of "If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the old ones" is higher among British students ($p \leq .05$). Nonetheless it can also be said that the acquisition level of the item "I wish our national holidays were celebrated in other countries" is roundly the same for both countries' students ($p > .05$).

It is seen that the acquisition levels of cultural values of students having average living standards differ between two countries ($p \leq .05$). When the mean rank order of related items are considered, the acquisition level of items other than that of "If I could, I would build new build-

ings to replace the old ones" is higher among Turkish students while the acquisition level of the item "If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the old ones" is higher among British students.

Although it is seen that there is no difference between two countries' students having high living standards regarding the acquisition levels of the item "I think of my town or village as my home" ($p \leq .05$) it is understood that the mean rank order of the related item is higher in favour of Turkish students. Indications related to other items are similar among students of low and average living standards. Therefore considering the points related to value acquisition among students of high living standards it can be said the Turkish students' acquisition level

Table 4: Cultural values at different socio-economic levels

<i>SEL</i>	<i>Items</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean rank points</i>	<i>Total rank points</i>	<i>U</i>	<i>Z</i>	<i>P</i>
<i>Low</i>	If we do our duty as citizens we support our country.	UK	171	130.56	22326.00	7620.00	-3.89	.00
		TR	118	165.92	19579.00			
		Total	289					
	When I go to a city, I want to visit the city's museum	UK	171	120.72	20643.00	5937.00	-6.19	.00
		TR	118	180.19	21262.00			
		Total	289					
	I think of my town or village as my home.	UK	171	133.56	22839.50	8133.50	-3.10	.00
		TR	118	161.57	19065.50			
		Total	289					
	If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the	UK	171	167.21	28592.50	6291.50	-5.57	.00
		TR	118	112.82	13312.50			
		Total	289					
<i>Average</i>	I wish our national holidays were celebrated in other	UK	171	141.78	24244.00	9538.00	-.812	.41
		TR	118	149.67	17661.00			
		Total	289					
	Historical places are what our ancestors have left us	UK	171	117.49	20091.00	5385.000	-7.14	.00
		TR	118	184.86	21814.00			
		Total	289					
	If we do our duty as citizens we support our country.	UK	190	152.57	28987.50	10842.50	-6.007	.00
		TR	171	212.59	36353.50			
		Total	289					
	When I go to a city, I want to visit the city's museum	UK	190	138.42	26300.50	8155.50	-8.42	.00
		TR	171	228.31	39040.50			
		Total	289					
<i>High</i>	I think of my town or village as my home.	UK	190	165.40	31425.50	13280.50	-3.36	.00
		TR	171	198.34	33915.50			
		Total	289					
	If I could, I would build new buildings to replace the	UK	190	202.68	38509.50	12125.50	-4.26	.00
		TR	171	156.91	26831.50			
		Total	289					
	I wish our national holidays were celebrated	UK	190	159.51	30306.00	12161.00	-4.27	.00
		TR	171	204.88	35035.00			
		Total	289					
	Historical places are what our ancestors have left us	UK	190	136.53	25940.50	7795.50	-9.39	.00
		TR	171	230.41	39400.50			
		Total	289					
	If we do our duty as citizens we support our country.	UK	61	75.97	4634.00	2743.00	-3.80	.00
		TR	130	105.40	13702.00			
		Total	191					
<i>High</i>	When I go to a city, I want to visit the city's museum	UK	61	60.75	3706.00	1815.00	-6.37	.00
		TR	130	112.54	14630.00			
		Total	191					
	I think of my town or village as my home.	UK	61	87.21	5320.00	3429.00	-1.70	.08
		TR	130	100.12	13016.00			
		Total	191					
	If I could, I would build new buildings to replace	UK	61	127.74	7792.00	2029.00	-5.84	.00
		TR	130	81.11	10544.00			
		Total	191					
	I wish our national holidays were celebrated in other	UK	61	79.07	4823.50	2932.50	-3.022	.00
		TR	130	103.94	13512.50			
		Total	191					
	Historical places are what our ancestors have left us	UK	61	65.72	4009.00	2118.00	-6.00	.00
		TR	130	110.21	14327.00			
		Total	191					

of above-mentioned values is higher than that of British students.

Analysis of Items Related to Respect Value

Table 5 provides statistics about the items related to the acquisition of respect value. It is seen that British and Turkish students do not differ regarding the items "*Sometimes I think that I cannot overcome my problems*" and "*I respect my teachers even when they make unfair decisions*" ($p > .05$), while there is striking difference between the acquisition levels of other items ($p \leq .05$). The items "*Even though my country's leaders made mistakes I still respect them, I respect my parents/carers, even if they make a decision which I don't like, If school rules are broken everyone suffers, Natural disasters are the result of not looking after our environment and Even though people are guilty of a terrible crime, they have the right to live*" are in favour of Turkish students and the items "*I'm not interested in how other cultures celebrate their special days and Following the rules is boring*" are in favour of British students ($p \leq .05$).

Accordingly British students are less interested than Turkish students in other countries' celebrations of special days. British students also feel much more than Turkish students that following the rules is boring.

When the mean rank order of items not differing much from each other ($p > .05$) are analyzed it is seen that the point of the item "*Sometimes I think that I cannot overcome my problems*" is higher for British students. Therefore it is concluded that Turkish students are more competent than British students in terms of solving problems they encounter. Moreover the mean rank order of the item "*I respect my teachers even when they make unfair decisions*" is higher among Turkish students. Therefore it can be said that the value acquisition related to this item is higher among Turkish students than British students.

Respect According to Gender Variable

When genders are compared with each other regarding the items related to acquisition of respect value; there is no difference between

Table 5: Respect in general

Items	Country	N	Mean rank order	Total order points	U	Z	P
Even though my country's leaders made mistakes I still	UK	422	347.50	146646.50	57393.50	-9.25	.00
	TR	419	495.02	207414.50			
	Total	841					
I'm not interested in how other cultures celebrate their special	UK	422	486.14	205153.00	60918.00	-8.17	.00
	TR	419	355.39	148908.00			
	Total	841					
I respect my parents/caregivers, even if they make a decision	UK	422	401.03	169233.00	79980.00	-2.64	.01
	TR	419	441.12	184828.00			
	Total	841					
Following the rules is boring.	UK	422	520.80	219778.00	46293.00	-12.56	.00
	TR	419	320.48	134283.00			
	Total	841					
Sometimes I think that I cannot overcome my problems.	UK	422	423.09	178542.00	87529.00	-.256	.79
	TR	419	418.90	175519.00			
	Total	841					
If school rules are broken everyone suffers	UK	422	279.27	117851.50	28598.50	-17.70	.00
	TR	419	563.75	236209.50			
	Total	841					
I respect my teachers even when they make unfair decisions.	UK	422	409.10	172638.50	83385.50	-1.49	.13
	TR	419	432.99	181422.50			
	Total	841					
Natural disasters are the result of not looking after our	UK	422	371.92	156951.00	67698.00	-6.036	.00
	TR	419	470.43	197110.00			
	Total	841					
Even though people are guilty of a terrible crime, they have	UK	422	352.74	148854.50	59601.50	-8.69	.00
	TR	419	489.75	205206.50			
	Total	841					

two countries ($p > .05$) regarding the value acquisition related to the items "I respect my parents/careers, even if they make a decision which I don't like and Sometimes I think that I cannot overcome my problems" for both male and female students. While there is no difference between female students ($p > .05$) regarding the item "I respect my teachers even when they make unfair decisions" there is a difference in favour of Turkish male students regarding the item "I respect my teachers even when they make unfair decisions".

However, concerning mean ranking points, it is seen that female British students' points are higher than female Turkish students' points. As a result, it can be said that female British students' value acquisition level regarding the value "I respect my teachers even when they make unfair decisions" is higher than that of Turkish students'. Furthermore, the results pertaining to items "Even though my country's leaders made mistakes, I still respect them; If school rules are broken everyone suffers; Natural disasters are the result of not looking after our environment; Even though people are guilty of a terrible crime, they have the right to live" differ in favour of Turkish students ($p \leq .05$), so it can be said that acquisition related to these values is higher among Turkish students.

The items "I'm not interested in how other cultures celebrate their special days; Following the rules is boring" differ in favour of British students ($p \leq .05$). According to this, male and female British students are less interested in other countries' cultural celebrations for special days than male and female Turkish students. In addition, more British male and female students think that obeying rules is boring compared to Turkish students.

Comparison of Respect Value According to Socio-economic Standards

When items related to respect value are compared between two countries according to socio-economic variable; while it is seen that the item "I respect my parents/caregivers, even if they make a decision which I don't like" does not differ between students having low and high economic standards ($p > .05$), it is also seen that it differs in favour of Turkish students for students having average economic standards ($p \leq .05$). Therefore, it can be said that acquisi-

tion level of this value is higher in Turkish students.

While there is no difference in comparison of two countries' students having low and average socio-economic standards regarding the item "*Sometimes I think that I cannot overcome my problems*" ($p > .05$), there is a substantial difference in favour of British students having high socio-economic standards. Therefore, it can be said that comparing two countries (Turkey and England), Turkish students with high socio-economic standards are more successful in dealing with personal problems than British students.

As to the item "*I respect my teachers even when they make unfair decisions*", while it is seen that there is no meaningful difference between two countries' students having low or high socio-economic standards ($p > .05$), there is a meaningful difference in favour of Turkish students having average socio-economic standards. Therefore, it can be said that regarding this item's acquisition level for students having average socio-economic standards, Turkish students have higher acquisition levels than British students.

As to the results concerning the item "*I'm not interested in how other cultures celebrate their special days*", although it is seen that British students' points are higher in comparison of mean ranking orders between two countries' students' socio-economic levels, there is a substantial difference only between students having low or average socio-economic standards ($p \leq .05$), and there is no meaningful difference between students having high socio-economic standards ($p > .05$). Therefore, it can be said that when two countries are compared regarding this value's acquisition level, Turkish students' acquisition level is higher than that of British students regardless of their socio-economic standards.

When the items "*Even though my country's leaders made mistakes I still respect them; If school rules are broken everyone suffers; Natural disasters are the result of not looking after our environment; and Even though people are guilty of a terrible crime, they have the right to live*" are compared between two countries by taking mean ranking orders into consideration, there is a substantial difference in favour of Turkish students ($p \leq .05$) regardless of their socio-economic standards. Therefore, it can be said that value acquisition levels for these values are higher in favour of Turkish students.

As to the item "*Following the rules is boring*", it is seen that there is a substantial difference in favour of British students ($p \leq .05$) regardless of their socio-economic standards. In conclusion, it can be said that regarding the points related to this value, British students score higher points than Turkish students regardless of their socio-economic standards, that is to say, they find it more boring to obey rules.

Analysis of the Items Related to Tolerance Value

In the analysis related to acquisition of the items concerning tolerance value; as Table 6 indicates, when British and Turkish students are compared, it is seen that results of six items related to tolerance value vary according to countries ($p \leq .05$). In order to find out in which country's favour these differences occur, the mean ranking points of the students in two countries have been analyzed. According to these points, it is seen that while the acquisition related to the items "I respect my friends' feelings about me; A problem can have different solutions; I can't stand it if someone keeps making the same mistake; I am happy when I behave like a good citizen" is higher for Turkish students, the mean ranking points related to the items "When I lose, I don't want to congratulate my rival; It is normal for people to have different beliefs" is higher for British students.

Tolerance According to Gender

In the analysis of acquisition of items related to tolerance value; when British and Turkish students are compared according to gender variable, it is seen that the item "I respect my friends' feelings about me" does not vary for both countries' male students ($p > .05$). Therefore, it can be concluded that students in both countries are similar to each other regarding their acquisition levels of this item. When points belonging to female students are analyzed, it is seen that Turkish students have higher points than British students regarding this item and there is a meaningful difference between two countries ($p \leq .05$). Therefore, it can be said that Turkish students have higher acquisition levels regarding this item and Turkish students have more constructive attitudes regarding their own friends' opinions about themselves.

The item concerning the tolerance value "When I lose, I don't want to congratulate my rival; It is normal for people to have different beliefs" varies in favour of England ($p \leq .05$). Therefore, it can be concluded that British students have higher acquisition levels regarding this item. It can be concluded that regardless of gender variable, British students are more tolerant than Turkish students in terms of congratulating their opponents and accepting that people might have different beliefs.

Table 6: Tolerance in general

Items	Country	N	Mean rank order	Total order points	U	Z	P
I respect my friends' feelings about me.	UK	422	401.92	169610.50	80357.50	-2.54	.01
	TR	419	440.22	184450.50			
	Total	841					
When I lose, I don't want to congratulate my rival.	UK	422	529.43	223421.50	42649.50	-13.41	.00
	TR	419	311.79	130639.50			
	Total	841					
A problem can have different solutions.	UK	422	377.66	159371.50	70118.50	-5.87	.00
	TR	419	464.65	194689.50			
	Total	841					
I can't stand it if someone keeps making the same mistake.	UK	422	367.77	155200.00	65947.00	-6.52	.00
	TR	419	474.61	198861.00			
	Total	841					
I am happy when I behave like a good citizen.	UK	422	352.08	148577.00	59324.00	-9.24	.00
	TR	419	490.42	205484.00			
	Total	841					
It is normal for people to have different beliefs.	UK	422	452.22	190838.00	75233.00	-4.24	.00
	TR	419	389.55	163223.00			
	Total	841					

It is also seen that the points related to the items concerning tolerance value "A problem can have different solutions; I can't stand it if someone keeps making the same mistake; I am happy when I behave like a good citizen" vary in favour of Turkish students for both male and female students. Therefore; it can be concluded that the acquisition levels regarding the values related to these items are higher for Turkish students.

Comparison of Tolerance Value According to Socio-economic Standards

When the items related to acquisition of tolerance value are compared between two countries according to socio-economic standard variable; it is seen that while there is no meaningful difference between British and Turkish students having low socio-economic standards ($p > .05$) regarding the item "I respect my friends' feelings about me", there is a meaningful difference between British and Turkish students having average or high living standards ($p \leq .05$), which is in favour of Turkish students. Therefore it can be concluded that Turkish students having low or high socio-economic standards have higher value acquisition percentage in terms of value acquisition levels of this item.

When points related to the item "It is normal for people to have different beliefs" are analyzed it is seen that while there is no meaningful difference between British and Turkish students having high socio-economic standards ($p > .05$) there is a meaningful difference between British and Turkish students having low or average socio-economic standards, which is in favour of British students ($p \leq .05$). Therefore it can be concluded that British students have higher acquisition level regarding this item which is related to tolerance. As to the item "When I lose, I don't want to congratulate my rival" it is seen that there is a meaningful difference in favour of British students ($p \leq .05$) regardless of socio-economic standards. Therefore it can be concluded that British students have higher acquisition levels than Turkish students regarding the acquisition level of this item which takes place in the teaching programs.

As to the points related to the items "A problem can have different solutions, I can't stand it if someone keeps making the same mistake, I am happy when I behave like a good citizen" taking

part in the teaching programs, the points related to these values differentiate in favour of Turkish students ($p \leq .05$). Therefore, it can be said that Turkish students have higher acquisition levels than British students regarding the acquisition level of tolerance values taking place in the teaching programs.

DISCUSSION

The acquisition level of following universal values such as *tolerance, respect, protecting and developing cultural values*, included in developed countries' curriculums as well as in primary school curriculum of Turkish National Education (in subject matters such as Religious and Moral Studies, Turkish, Social Studies, Life Studies...), has been compared with that of England, one of most developed European countries according to gender and socio-economic variables. This project is putting forward the value acquisition levels of British and Turkish students aged 11 and 12 regarding the following values: *tolerance, respect, protecting and developing cultural values*. It does so by taking into consideration their genders and socio-economic standards.

When the way universal, national and other values to be acquired are dealt with in Turkish primary school curriculum is evaluated in a general way, it is seen that Primary School Religious and Moral Studies is the subject which contains the highest number of values (61 values) after that of Life Studies. They do not contain target acquisition levels for values and values are only implicitly covered in curriculum of the Turkish. When values in curriculums are studied from the point of view of their content and extent, it seems obvious that target acquisition level of values should be matched up with students general progress stages and determined accordingly. For example, although tolerance is included in most of primary school curriculums for years 3-8, it is not constrained in accordance with students' ages. It is also seen that the extent of the value *being eager to learn* as well as the content of the values *altruism* and *gratitude* are not sufficiently detailed. In order to set it right, values in primary school curriculum should be detailed with a common language and the content and target acquisition levels of values should be categorized in accordance with students' progress stages. As Doganay (2006) puts it, val-

ues and values education should be an inherent part of formal education and students should acquire them through planned educational experiences.

Before primary school curriculum changed, Akbas (2007) had developed an applied model for values education. At the end of his research, Akbas (2007), like Aslan (2007), emphasized that curriculums are very important from the point of view of values education and that this should be taken into consideration in new curriculums to be prepared. In studies on high school students carried out by Sađnak (2007), Gomleksiz and Bulut (2007) and Ozensel (2007) it is pointed out that high school students experience some deficiencies regarding values. Current study put light on the acquisition levels of different values that have been included in the elementary school curriculums in two countries; which would lead practitioners and researchers give more thought on teaching values to children in Turkey.

In his research on the effectiveness of the SEAL program carried out in socio-economically low schools in central Bedfordshire, Over (2010) tried to find answers to the following questions: What are the effects of the targeted (wave two) Primary SEAL small group intervention (silver set materials) on social and emotional outcomes for children in lower schools in Central Bedfordshire? Do pupils rate themselves as more skilled after the intervention? Do parents and teachers rate pupils as more skilled after the intervention? Are the results more positive immediately after the intervention or several weeks later? He discovered that pupils rate themselves more favorably on social and emotional measures as a result of the small group SEAL intervention. Moreover, more research is needed on the effects of the intervention on role model pupils. No effects were found for role model pupils in this study or in Humphrey et al's (2008) study. Based on the current study researchers in England would have a chance to give more thought on developing alternative ways to help students gain values.

CONCLUSION

When items related to acquisition of common cultural values taking place in the teaching programs of Turkey and England are compared between two countries; it can be said that Turk-

ish students' general acquisition level of values in the teaching programs is higher than that of British students. When male and female students are evaluated separately regarding these results, the acquisition level of cultural values among Turkish students is higher than British students.

Results of the analyses declared that British students are less interested than Turkish students in other countries' celebrations of special days. British students also feel much more than Turkish students that following the rules is boring. It can be said that the value acquisition related to this item is higher among Turkish students than British students. It can be said that regarding the points related to this value, British students score higher points than Turkish students regardless of their socio-economic status, that is to say, they find it more boring to obey rules.

In the analysis of acquisition of items related to tolerance value; when British and Turkish students are compared according to gender variable, it is seen that Turkish students have higher acquisition levels regarding tolerance level, and Turkish students have more constructive attitudes towards their own friends' opinions about themselves.

When the items related to acquisition of tolerance value are compared between two countries according to socio-economic standard variable; the item "It is normal for people to have different beliefs" has no meaningful difference between British and Turkish students having high socio-economic standards. However, British students give higher rates than Turkish students in low or average socio-economic standards. Therefore while it can be concluded that British students have higher acquisition level regarding this item which is related to tolerance, Turkish students have higher acquisition levels than British students regarding the acquisition level of tolerance values taking place in the teaching programs.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Values in curriculums ought to be dealt with a common language as much as possible. Turkey's existing primary school curriculums (Religious Culture and Moral Studies, Life Studies, Social Studies) can be configured in such a way that they meet requirements related to values education. Similar studies can be carried out in

different educational levels. Values can be prioritized considering the needs of schools regarding values education, In this context, the alternative measurement instruments for evaluating value acquisition levels should be developed. Not only values should be dealt with a common language but also contents and target acquisition levels of values should be classified taking students' development levels into consideration. As the literature puts it above, values and values education can only be acquired through planned learning experiences integrated to curriculums of formal education. The Ministry of National Education must lead the way and provide guidance concerning doing researches, preparing works and carrying out projects. A new values education program suitable to our own society's characteristics can be prepared.

REFERENCES

- Adiguzel OC, Ergunay O 2012. Türkiye'de Degerler Uzerine Gerceklestirilen Lisansustu Tezlerin Egitim Bilimleri ve Ogretmen Yetistirme Perspektifinden Incelenmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 11(41): 18-33.
- Akbas O 2007. Turk milli egitim sisteminin duyuusal amaclarinin ilkogretim II. Kademedeki gercekleme derecesinin deđerlendirilmesi. In: Recep Kaymakcan, H Hokelekli, S Zengin (Eds.). *Degerler ve Egitimi Uluslar Arasi Sempozyumu* 26-28 Kasim 2004. Istanbul: DEM Yayinlari, pp. 673-695.
- Arseven AD 1994. *Alan Arastirma Yontemi İlkeler Teknikler Ornekler*. Ankara: Gul Yayınevi.
- Aslan Korkut 2007. *Ogretmen Goruslerine Gore Ilkogretim Birinci Basamaktaki Ogrencilerin Temel Bilgi, Beceri ve Degerleri Kazanma Duzeyleri*. Master's Thesis, Unpublished. Eskişehir: Anadolu University.
- Bacanli Faruk 1995. *Mesleki grup rehberliginin lise ogrencilerinin mesleki olgunluk duzeylerine etkisi*. Ph. D. Thesis, Unpublished. Ankara: Gazi University.
- Buyukduvenci S 2009. *Kuresellesen Egitim, Kuresellesmenin Egitimi*, Uluslararası Egitim Felsefesi Kongresi, Ankara: Egitim Bir-Sen.
- Buyukozturk S 2007. *Sosyal Bilimler Icin Veri Analizi El Kitabı: Istatistik, Arastirma Deseni, SPSS Uygulamaları ve Yorum*. Ankara: PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Cohen L, Manion L, Morrison K 2000. *Research Methods in Education*. 5th Edition. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Daghous N, Petrof J V, Pons F 1999. Values and adoption of innovations: A cross-cultural study. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 16(4): 314-331.
- Demircioglu IH, Tokdemir MA 2008. Degerlerin Olusturulma Surecinde Tarih Egitimi: Amac, Islev ve Icerik, *Degerler Egitimi Dergisi*, 6(15): 69-88.
- Department for Education and Employment 1999. *The National Curriculum Handbook for Primary Teachers in England (Key Stages 1 and 2)*. London.
- Deveci H, Dal S 2006. Ogretmen Adaylarinin Ulusal Degerlere Iliskin Gorusleri. *Paper presented in International Symposium III on Teacher Training*, Onsekiz Mart University, Canakkale, May 4 to 6, 2006.
- Dogan I 2001. *Vatandaslik Demokrasi ve Insan Haklari*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- Doganay A 2006. Ogretimde Kavram ve Genellemenelerin Gelistirilmesi. In: C Ozturk, D Dursun (Eds.): *Hayat Bilgisi ve Sosyal Bilgiler Ogretimi*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık, pp. 266-294.
- El-Hassan K, Kahil R 2005. The effect of living values: An educational program on behaviors and attitudes of elementary students in a private school in Lebanon. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 33: 81-90.
- Erdogan I 2000. *Cagdas Egitim Sistemleri*. Istanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Evin I, Kafadar O 2004. Ilkogretim Sosyal Bilgiler Programinin ve Ders Kitaplarinin Ulusal ve Evrensel Degerler Yonunden Icerik Cozumlemesi. *Turk Egitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3): 293-304.
- Feather N 1975. *Values in Education and Society*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gomleksiz, MN, Bulut I 2007. Yeni fen ve teknoloji dersi ogretim programinin uygulamadaki etkililiginin deđerlendirilmesi. *Hacettepe Egitim Fakultesi Dergisi*, 32: 76-88.
- Gungor E 1998. *Degerler Psikolojisi Uzerinde Arastirmalar: Ahlak Psikolojisi, Ahlaki Degerler ve Ahlaki Gelisme*. Istanbul: Otuk Yayinlari.
- Hall K, Ozerk K 2008. Primary Curriculum and Assessment: England and Other Countries. *Primary Review Research Report 3/1*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Hallam S 2009. An evaluation of the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) Programme: Promoting positive behaviour, effective learning and well-being In primary school children. *Oxford Review of Education*, 35(3): 313-330.
- Hill BV 1998. Values education: The Australian experience. *Prospects*, 28: 173-191.
- Hokelekli H, Gunduz T 2007. Ustun Yetenekli Cocukların Deger Yonelimleri ve Egitimleri. In: R Kaymakcan, H Hokelekli, A Arslan, M Zengin, (Eds.): *Degerler ve Egitimi*. Istanbul: Dem Yayinlari, pp. 371-396.
- Humphrey N, Kalambouka A, Bolton J, Lendrum A, Wigelsworth M, Lennie C, Farrell P 2008. Primary Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) Evaluation of Small Group Work. Research Report DCSF-RR064, Manchester: School of Education, University of Manchester. From <<http://www.pshe-association.org.uk/uploads/media/17/6935.pdf>> (Retrieved May 25, 2012).
- Kahle L, Sharron E, Beatty PH 1986. Alternative measurement approaches to consumer values: The List of Values (LOV) and Life Styles (VALS). *Journal of Consumer Research*, 13: 405-409.
- Keskin Yusuf 2008. *Turkiye'de Sosyal Bilgiler Ogretim Programlarında Degerler Egitimi: Tarihsel Gelismis, 1998 ve 2004 Programlarının Etkililiginin Arastirilmesi*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished Istanbul: Marmara University.

- Kilby RW 1993. *The Study of Human Values*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Kirsch I, Jong J, Lafontaine D, McQueen J, Mendelovits J, Monseur C 2002. *Reading for Change Performance and Engagement Across Countries Results From Pisa 2000*. Paris: OECD Publications.
- Koc K 2007. *Ilkogretim 7. Sınıflarda Okutulan Vatandaşlık ve İnsan Hakları Eğitimi Dersinde Öğrenciye Kazandırılması Amaçlanan Evrensel Değerler İlişkin Tutumlar Üzerinde Öğretim Sürecinin Etkisi*. Master's Thesis, Unpublished. Elazığ: Firat University.
- Koylu M 2006. *Kuresel Ahlak Eğitimi*. İstanbul: Değerler Eğitimi Merkezi Yayınları.
- Kucuradi I 1971. *İnsan ve Değerleri*, İstanbul: Free Press.
- Lickona T 1993. The return of character education. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3): 6-11.
- McMillan JH 2000. Fundamental Assessment Principles for Teachers and School Administrators. Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation, 7(8). From <<http://Pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7&n=8>> (Retrieved September 9, 2012).
- MEB 2009a. *Ilkogretim 1, 2 ve 3. Sınıflar Hayat Bilgisi Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kilavuzu*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Yayınları.
- MEB 2009b. *Ilkogretim Sosyal Bilgiler 4.-5. Sınıf Programı*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Yayınları.
- MEB 2009c. *Ilkogretim Türkçe Dersi Öğretim Programı ve Kilavuzu (1-5. Sınıflar)*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Yayınları.
- MEB 2010. *Ilkogretim Din Kültürü ve Ahlak Bilgisi Dersi (4, 5, 6, 7 ve 8. Sınıflar) Öğretim Programı ve Kilavuzu*, Ankara: Milli Eğitim Yayınları.
- NCO (National Curriculum Online) 2012. From <<http://www.nc.uk.net>> (Retrieved May 18, 2012).
- Official Home Page of Department for Education UK 2012b. From <https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/_arc_AbouttheDepartment/Page11/CM%205902> (Retrieved December 23, 2012).
- Official Home Page of Department for Education UK 2012c. From <<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/QCA-99-457.pdf>> (Retrieved December 23, 2012).
- Official Home Page of Department for Education UK 2012d. From <<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/SEAL%20Guidance%202005.pdf>> (Retrieved November 10, 2012).
- Official Home Page of Department for Education UK 2012a. From <<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/QCA/99/457>> (Retrieved December 23, 2012).
- Official Home Page of Department for Education UK 2012e. From <<https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/Every%20Parent%20Matters.pdf>> (Retrieved November 05, 2012).
- Official Home Page of Eurydice (Network on education systems and policies in European) 2012. From <<http://www.eurydice.org>> (Retrieved May 18, 2012).
- Official Home Page of National Archives UK 2012a. From <<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20081117141643/standards.dfes.gov.uk/primary/publications/banda/seal/>> (Retrieved December 28, 2012).
- Official Home Page of National Archives UK 2012b. From <<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20081117141643/standards.dfes.gov.uk/primary/publications/banda/seal/>> (Retrieved December 28, 2012).
- Official Home Page of National Curriculum Online UK 2012. From <<http://www.nc.uk.net>> (Retrieved May 18, 2012).
- Official Home Page of UK Legislation 2012. From <<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40/contents>> (Retrieved December 20, 2012).
- Oguzhan F 1981. *Eğitim Terimleri Sözlüğü*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları.
- Otter Clare 2010. *The Impact of Primary Seal Small Group Interventions (Silver Set Materials) on Social and Emotional Outcomes for Pupils*. Ph.D. Thesis, Unpublished. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Ozensel E 2007. Liseli Kız ve Erkek Öğrencilerin Değer Yargıları. In: R Kaymakcan, H Hokelekli, Arslan, M Zengin (Eds.): *Değerler ve Eğitimi*. İstanbul: Dem Yayınları, pp.743-772.
- Ozguven I E 2003. *Psikolojik Testler*. Ankara: PDREM Yayınları.
- Philips D, Schweisfurth M 2008. *Comparative and International Education*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Rokeach M 1973. *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.
- Ryan K 1993. Mining the values in the curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, 51(3): 16-18.
- Sagnak M 2007. Orta Öğretim Okullarında Öğrenim Gören Öğrencilerin Okulun Örgütsel Değerlerine İlişkin Algıları İle Kişisel Değerleri Arasındaki Uyum Düzeyleri. In: Recep Kaymakcan, H Hokelekli, S Zengin (Eds.): *Değerler ve Eğitimi Uluslar Arası Sempozyumu* 26-28 Kasım 2004. İstanbul: DEM Yayınları, pp. 715-726.
- Schwartz SH 1992. Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. In: M Zanna (Ed.): *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology V 25*. New York: Academic Press, pp.1-65.
- Schwartz S H 1996. Value priorities and behaviour. In: C Seligman, JM Olsonve, MP Zanna (Eds.): *The Psychology of Values: The Ontario Symposium*, New Jersey: Lawrence Publishers, pp. 1-24.
- Shuayb M, O'donnell S 2008. Aims and Values in Primary Education: England and Other Countries. *Research Survey1/2*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, s. 1-40.
- Spranger E 1928. *Types of Men. The Psychology and Ethics of Personality*. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation.
- Tavsancil E 2002. *Tutumların Ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile Veri Analizi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- TDK 1983. *Türkçe sözlük*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu Yayını.
- Tezcan M 1997. *Eğitim Sosyolojisi*. Ankara: Free Press.
- Turgut Mustafa 2010. *Türkiye'de Aile Değerleri Araştırması*, Ankara: Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü.
- Ultanir G 2000. *Karsılaştırmalı Eğitim Bilimi Ku-ram ve Teknikler*. Ankara: Eylül Yayınları.
- Veuglers W 2000. Different ways of teaching values, *Educational Review*, 52: 37-46.
- Yesil R, Aydın D 2007. Demokratik Değerlerin Eğitiminde Yöntem ve Zamanlama. *TSA*, 11(2): 65-84.