

Regression Analysis of Value Preferences for Liking Children Attitude of Primary and Secondary Education Teacher Candidates*

Büşra Ergin¹, Elif Nur Bozer Öz Saraç^{1*}

¹ Ahmet Keleşoğlu Faculty of Education, Necmettin Erbakan University

*This article was presented as an oral presentation at the 1st National Values Education Congress held on 31 October-2 November 2013

** E-mail of the corresponding author: elifnurbozer[at]outlook.com

Abstract

The main purpose of the research is to determine the degree to which the value preferences of the teacher candidates predicts their liking children attitudes. In this research, "Dilmaç and Arıcak Values Scale" developed by Dilmaç and Arıcak (2012) was used to determine the value orientations of teacher candidates and "Barnett Liking of Children Scale (BLOCS)" developed by Barnett and Sinisi (1990) was used to determine liking children attitudes. The study group of the research which is in the screening model constitutes 264 teacher candidates who are studying at Ahmet Keleşoğlu Education Faculty of Necmettin Erbakan University in 2012-2013 school year. The data were analyzed by SPSS 18.0 statistical package program.

According to the findings of the research, it is found that there are significant differences in social, career and intellectual values according to gender; in the value of spiritual, materialistic, human dignity, romance, freedom, futuwwa and the scores obtained from Barnett Children's Love Scale show no significant differences according to gender. It is found that there is no significant difference according to the department in the values of social, career, intellectual, spiritual, materialistic, romantic, freedom, futuwwa values and the scores obtained from Barnett Child Love Scale but only in the human dignity value there is a significant difference. According to age variable; there is a negative meaningful relationship between age and social, career value sub-dimensions and positive meaningful relationship between age and romantic values sub-dimension. Regression analysis revealed that subscales of social, career, intellectual, spiritual, human dignity, freedom, and futuwwa values are found to be important predictors of children liking attitudes of teacher candidates.

Keywords: Children Liking, Value

1. Introduction

It is no coincidence that in the middle of the nineteenth century, the notion of values started to be explicitly mentioned along with the ontology's independence of ethics. As it is known, with the Enlightenment and Modernism, positioning of human being as a just thinking entity has reached its summit in Hegelianism. However, with the criticism of this thought, especially with the trends of positivism and materialism, nature and human interpretations have been left to the control of mechanical science and materialistic ontology. Every existing value has been transformed into a phenomenon, every norm into a truth, every idea into an ideology (Tillich, 1960:73).

Therefore, modern science and education thought, shaped by the understanding of positivism and scientism has been influential in many countries and has taken the issues of "reality" and "values" to the dichotomy, splitting into two opposite areas, and with a more optimistic expression to bifurcate (Reuben, 1996). In this case, philosophers have begun to question the value dimension of the realities on which human dignity and its meaning are based. Accordingly, philosophers have developed a method called the doctrine of values (Tillich, 1960:73).

If we would define values in general, it may be defined as the tendency of an individual to prefer certain situations in relation to other individuals (Hofstede, 1991). A value is a consistent and profound belief that a particular human behavior or purpose of life is superior to another (Dökmen, 2005). According to Dunlop (1996), the concept of value is briefly defined as the qualities of objects. Aydın (2001) defined values as meanings that the individuals impose on different factors in their lives. As a term, the value is a common symbolic system element that serves as a criterion or standard for choosing between method options before acting (Cafo & Somuncuoğlu, 2000).

As a result of his researches, Spranger (1928) examined values in six groups as aesthetic, theoretical (scientific), economic, political, social and religious values, while Rokeach (1973) examined as objective and instrumental

values and Schwartz (1992) examined values in ten groups as power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, tradition, conformity, security (as cited in Akbaş, 2004).

Values are the facts that can be taught and learned. The value's taking different forms and evaluating differently in different societies show that they have been learned later. Then, above all, the values are matters of education. And this education is not just about the lessons taught in schools. In a sense that the whole society is a school and every human being is a teacher and a student of this school. The learning of values is a social learning in the form of role learning (Aydın, 2010).

Values can be gained by education in various organizations as well as the result of various interactions that individuals enter by their surroundings. When considered in this context, schools will be the most authoritative and perhaps effective institutions in this regard. Reviewing the relevant literature it is seen that there are various studies on the fact that the values can be taught and how they are included in the teachers' and education program (İşcan & Senemoğlu, 2009; Kan, 2010; İşcan, 2011; Yalar & Yelken, 2011; Balcı & Yelken, 2010; Yaşaroğlu, 2013). When teaching is examined by a system approach, the most important elements of the teaching system are students, teachers, teaching materials and learning-teaching environments. The importance of these elements of the process need to be grasped and they should be organized in such a way as to work effectively and harmoniously together to achieve the desired ends (Yalın, 2008).

Teachers from the touchstones of the system approach undertake a major responsibility not only to teach the students the knowledge, skills and values necessary to successfully participate in the social life, but also to teach the behaviors that are demanded in terms of social life and to reinforce learned knowledge, skills, values and behaviors. In this context teacher-child communication come to forefront (Beyazkürk & Keleş, 2005; Howe, 2000; Justice, Cottone, Maehburn & Rimm-Kaufman, 2008; Murray & Grenberg, 2000; Pianta & LaParo, 2003; Rudaill, 2011; Saltalı & Erbay, 2013).

The attitude towards children refers to the basic belief of an individual about children and being with children (Barnett & Sinisi 1990). Liking a child is one of the most admissible forms of unrequited love (Mete, 2005). Downing, Ryndak, and Clark (2000) list characteristics such as liking children, interacting with children, being patient, concerned, being gentle and flexible, communicating with adults and children and staying calm in order to become an educator. In this regard, the attitude of liking children is seen as an important teacher competence (Gelbal & Duyan, 2010). Although Turkish society loves children and it has been said for a long time (Onur, 2007), there is a lack of knowledge about primary school teachers' love of children. It is thought that the reason for this lack is that this aspect of the teacher characteristics has not been directly addressed and about attitudes about showing love to children in Turkish society.

Taking all these factors into consideration, it was thought that the value preferences of the teacher candidates could affect their childlike attitudes. When the literature was examined, specifically, no study on this subject has been found.

1.1. Purpose of the research

The main aim of the research is to seek answers to the following questions:

1. Do the value preferences and the child-liking attitudes of the teacher candidates differ significantly according to gender and department variables?
2. Is there significant correlations between age and values and child-liking attitudes?
3. Are the value preferences of teacher candidates predicting child-liking attitudes?

2. Method

In this section, the research model, study group, data collection instruments, and statistical methods used in the analysis of data are included.

2.1. Research Model

The research is in the general screening model and has a quantitative paradigm in the data context.

2.2. Study Group

The study group of this research constitutes 264 teacher candidates who are studying at Ahmet Keleşoğlu Education Faculty of Necmettin Erbakan University in 2012-2013 school year. The demographic characteristics of the study group were 183 (69.3%) females and 81 (30.7%) males, with an average age of 21.71, range of 17-37 and 134 (50.8%) primary education departments (classroom teacher, social studies teacher, religious culture and ethics) and 130 (49.2%) secondary education departments (physics teacher, chemistry teacher, biology teacher, history teacher, Turkish language and literature teacher, English teacher, mathematics teacher).

2.3. Data collection instruments

In this research, "Dilmaç and Arıcağ Values Scale" developed by Dilmaç and Arıcağ (2012) was used to determine the value orientations of teacher candidates and "Barnett Liking of Children Scale (BLOCS)" developed by Barnett and Sinisi (1990) was used to determine liking children attitudes.

Dilmaç & Arıcağ Values Scale: The value scale developed by Dilmaç and Arıcağ (2012) consists of 39 items. The scale is implemented in a way that the participants make an assessment ranging from 0 (do not matter) to 9 (very important) after reading a total of 39 values according to the importance they have given in terms of being a principle that directs their lives. It's a likert type scale. Scores ranging from 0 to 351 can be taken from the scale. Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient techniques were used in the reliability calculations of the scale. It consists of nine factors and all factor loads range from .45 to .80. Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability coefficients of "Dilmaç and Arıcağ Values Scale" were calculated on the basis of factors of scale. These coefficients, the value dimensions and the values they contain are tabulated below.

Table 1. Value Dimensions, Content and Reliability Coefficients

Value Dimension	The values that the value dimension contain	Coefficients
Social values	Benevolence , modesty (prudency), social peace, respect, right to life, responsibility consistency (in behaviors), tolerance, self-discipline	,90
Career values	Quality, career, dignity/ prestige, reputation, education, outer discipline	,80
Intellectual values	Physical health, mental health, knowledge, working, success, personal development	,78
Spiritual	Worship, religion / faith, belief / ideology, inner peace	,81
Materialistic values	Money, property, status	,78
Human dignity	Virtue, honor, justice	,61
Romantic values	Love, partner / lover, pleasure / enjoyment	,66
Freedom	Freedom / independence, culture, labor	,65
Futuwwa	Generosity, courage	,63

Barnett Liking of Children Scale: "Barnett's Liking of Children Scale" was developed by Barnett and Sinisi (1990) to measure individual's attitudes of liking children. The standardization of the scale in Turkey was done by Duyan and Gelbal in 2008. Barnett and Sinisi (1990) found the test-retest reliability of the scale as 0.91 and the internal consistency coefficient as 0.93. In the adaptation study for Turkey, the test-retest reliability of the scale was 0.85 and the internal consistency coefficient was 0.92 (Duyan & Gelbal, 2008).

Participants are asked to report opinions in seven grades ranging from 'I do not agree' to 'I totally agree' in each of the 14-item scale. Four of the 14 items in the measure are negative (3, 6, 10, 13 items), while ten are positive. When the scale is scored those who gave the answer "I agree totally" to the positive items get "7" points while the ones choosing "I do not agree" get "1" point. For the negative items, on the contrary, scoring is done in the opposite direction. Accordingly, scores that can be taken from the scale range from 98 to 14. The high scores on the scale showed that the participants liked the children more, whereas the low scores showed the less affection (Duyan & Gelbal, 2008; Gelbal & Duyan, 2010).

2.4. Data Analysis

The data obtained from the data collection tools in the study were analyzed with the SPSS 18.0 package program. Firstly, in terms of some of the variables discussed in the survey, the descriptive, frequency and percentage distributions of the group characteristics were extracted. The independent t-test was used to test whether the scores obtained from the Dilmaç & Arıcağ Values Scale and the Barnett Liking of Children Scale differed by gender and department, and the Pearson Moments Multiplication Correlation Coefficient technique was used to determine whether the values correlated with age.

Regression analysis technique was used to determine the level of predicting of value preference of primary school and secondary school teacher candidates to their liking of children attitudes.

3. Findings

In this section, statistical analyzes of data gathered in accordance with the main and sub-purposes of the research are presented and interpretations based on the findings are made.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics for the Subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcağ Values Scale and the Barnett Liking of Children Scale

Variables	N	\bar{X}	\bar{X} SE	Median	Mode	sd	Min.	Max.
Social values	264	81.75	.57	85.00	90.00	9.39	43.00	90.00
Career values	264	37.96	.36	39.00	45.00	6.01	15.00	45.00
Intellectual values	264	48.24	.34	49.50	54.00	5.58	25.00	54.00
Spiritual	264	33.79	.22	36.00	36.00	3.73	17.00	36.00
Materialistic values	264	18.28	.37	19.00	20.00	6.08	.00	27.00
Human dignity	264	25.73	.14	27.00	27.00	2.37	12.00	27.00
Romantic values	264	19.40	.37	21.00	23.00	6.12	.00	27.00
Freedom	264	24.28	.18	25.00	27.00	2.95	11.00	27.00
Futuwwa	264	15.90	.14	16.00	18.00	2.27	7.00	18.00
Barnett Liking of Children	264	81.41	.90	85.00	98.00	14.65	28.00	98.00

In Table 2, descriptive statistics related to the scores obtained from the subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcağ Values Scale and the Barnett Liking Children Scale applied to teacher candidates were given. Another descriptive analysis related to the research is demographic characteristics. The demographic characteristics of the study group show that 183 (%69.3) female and 81 (%30.7) male teacher candidates had participated. The mean of age is 21.71 and range of age is 17-37 (sd: 3.12). 134 (%50.8) teacher candidates were from primary school departments and 130 (%49.2) teacher candidates were from secondary school departments.

Table 3: Results of t-test on the Subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcağ Values Scale and the Barnett Liking of Children Scale according to Gender Variable

Value	Gender	n	\bar{X}	Se	t	p
Social values	Female	183	82.91	8.56	3.059	.002*
	Male	81	79.13	10.65		
Career values	Female	183	38.49	5.39	2.158	.032*
	Male	81	36.77	7.11		
Intellectual values	Female	183	48.78	4.98	2.378	.018*
	Male	81	47.02	6.62		
Spiritual	Female	183	34.04	3.59	1.603	.110
	Male	81	33.24	4.01		
Materialistic values	Female	183	18.61	5.67	1.236	.219
	Male	81	17.53	6.90		
Human dignity	Female	183	25.90	2.19	1.777	.077
	Male	81	25.34	2.71		
Romantic values	Female	183	19.31	6.10	-.370	.712
	Male	81	19.61	6.22		
Freedom	Female	183	24.29	2.96	.060	.953
	Male	81	24.27	2.94		
Futuwwa	Female	183	15.74	2.31	-1.683	.094
	Male	81	16.24	2.17		
Barnett Liking of Children	Female	183	82.48	14.56	-1.775	.078
	Male	81	79.01	14.67		

*p< 0,05

When Table 3 is examined it is seen that there is a difference according to gender, in terms of social, career and intellectual values. In the social values, the average of male students was 79.13, while the average of female students was 82.91. When t-test was used to check whether the difference between the mean scores of the two groups was meaningful or not ($t = 3.059$), $p < 0.05$ was found to be significant and the mean scores of females were found to be higher. For career values, the average of males was 36.77, while the average of female students was 38.49. When t-test was used to check whether the difference between the mean scores of the two groups was significant, it was found to be significant at ($t = 2.158$) $p < 0.05$ and the mean scores of the girls were found to be higher. The average of men for intellectual values was 47.02, while the average of female students was found to

be 48.78. When the two groups were controlled by t-test, it was found that ($t = 2.378$), $p < 0.05$ was significant and the mean scores of the females were higher. In the values of spiritual, materialistic, human dignity, romance, freedom, futuwwa, and Barnett Liking of Children Scale scores, $p > 0.05$ was found not to be significantly different by gender.

Table 4. Results of t-test on the Subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcağ Values Scale and the Barnett Liking of Children Scale according to department variable

Value	Department	n	\bar{X}	se	t	p
Social values	Secondary Education	130	81.20	9.62	-.942	.347
	Primary Education	134	82.29	9.17		
Career values	Secondary Education	130	37.80	6.06	-.431	.667
	Primary Education	134	37.12	5.98		
Intellectual values	Secondary Education	130	47.78	5.53	-1.314	.190
	Primary Education	134	48.68	5.61		
Spiritual	Secondary Education	130	33.46	3.85	-1.415	.158
	Primary Education	134	34.11	3.60		
Materialistic values	Secondary Education	130	18.10	5.89	-.453	.651
	Primary Education	134	18.44	6.29		
Human dignity	Secondary Education	130	25.39	2.82	-2.326	.021*
	Primary Education	134	26.06	1.78		
Romantic values	Secondary Education	130	19.66	5.69	.690	.491
	Primary Education	134	19.14	6.53		
Freedom	Secondary Education	130	24.30	2.79	.107	.915
	Primary Education	134	24.26	3.10		
Futuwwa	Secondary Education	130	15.83	2.13	-.443	.658
	Primary Education	134	15.96	2.41		
Barnett Liking of Children	Secondary Education	130	81.71	14.31	.326	.745
	Primary Education	134	81.12	15.02		

* $p < 0,05$

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that there is a difference according to the department in terms of human dignity. In human dignity, the average of the secondary education departments is 25.39, while the average of the primary education departments is 26.06. When t-test was used to check whether the difference between the mean scores of the two groups were significant ($t = -2.326$), $p < 0.05$ was found to be significant and the mean scores of the primary education departments were found to be higher. It was found that there were no significant differences in the social, career, intellectual, spiritual, materialistic, romantic, freedom, futuwwa values and the points obtained from Barnett Liking of Children Scale at to the level of $p > 0.05$ according to department variable.

Table 5. Correlations between Age, Barnett Liking of Children Scale and the Subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcak Values Scale

	Age	Barnett Liking of Children	Social Values	Career Values	Intellectual Values	Spiritual	Materialistic Values	Human Dignity	Romantic Values	Freedom	Futuwwa
Age	1	-.052	-.160*	-.176*	-.095	.052	-.117	-.098	.126*	-.039	.008
Barnett Liking of Children		1	.359*	.282*	.322*	.370*	-.018	.287*	.040	.308*	.239*
Social Values			1	.524*	.539*	.320*	.169*	.640*	.117	.410*	.299*
Career Values				1	.663*	.341*	.554*	.293*	.240*	.545*	.353*
Intellectual Values					1	.409*	.330*	.352*	.205*	.565*	.390*
Spiritual						1	.071	.335*	.136*	.288*	.269*
Materialistic Values							1	.127*	.208*	.284*	.030
Human Dignity								1	.011	.243*	.187*
Romantic Values									1	.198*	.178*
Freedom										1	.371*
Futuwwa											1

*p < 0,05

As it is seen at Table 5, there are significant negative relationship between age and "social", "career" (values subscales) and positive between age and "romantic" (values sub-scale) (respectively $r = -.16$, $r = -.18$, $p < .01$ and $r = .13$, $p < .05$). In addition, the significant correlation coefficients between the Barnett Liking of Children Scale and the subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcak Values Scale vary between .24 and .37 and the significant correlation coefficients between the subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcak Values Scale in itself vary between .13 and .66.

Table 6: The Regression Coefficients Showing the Predictive Power of Teacher Candidates' Value Preference to the Liking of Children Attitudes

	R	R ²	β	t	F	p
SOCIAL VALUES	.359	.129	.359	6.22	38.72*	.000
CAREER VALUES	.282	.080	.282	4.75	22.64*	.000
INTELLECTUAL VALUES	.322	.104	.322	5.50	30.25*	.000
SPIRITUAL	.370	.137	.370	6.44	41.55*	.000
MATERIALISTIC VALUES	.018	.000	-.018	-.287	.082	.704
HUMAN DIGNITY	.287	.082	.287	4.84	23.44*	.000
ROMANTIC VALUES	.040	.002	.040	.645	.416	.520
FREEDOM	.308	.095	.308	5.24	27.51*	.000
FUTUWWA	.239	.057	.239	3.97	15.83*	.000

When table 6 is examined, it is seen that the "social", "career", "intellectual", "spiritual", "human dignity", "freedom" and "futuwwa" values subscales of the Dilmaç & Arıcak Values Scale have been found to be as important predictors, at $p < .05$ significance level, of teacher candidates' liking of children attitudes. Another result is that, at the $p > .05$ significant level, "materialistic" and "romantic" values subscales do not predict teacher candidates' liking of children attitudes.

When the table is examined, "social" values represent 13% of the variance of liking of children attitudes, "career" values represent 8% of the variance of liking of children attitudes, "intellectual" values represent 10% of the variance of liking of children attitudes, "spiritual" values represent 14% of the variance of liking of children attitudes, "human dignity" values represent 8% of the variance of liking of children attitudes, "freedom" values represent 10% of the variance of liking of children attitudes, and "futuwwa" values represent 6% of the variance of liking of children attitudes.

Büyüköztürk (2002) suggests that in behavioral sciences it is difficult to keep the explained variance ratio high, that 30% or more explained variance ratio is sufficient at single factor scales, and that the explained variance is expected to be higher in multi-factor scales. Within this scope, the variance ratio (69%) explained by the Dilmaç & Arıcak Values Scale seems to be able to predict the candidates' scores from the Barnett Liking of Children Scale at an acceptable level.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In the study, the predicting of primary and secondary teacher candidates' value preferences to children liking attitudes was examined. As a result of the research, it was found that there was no significant difference according to gender, in the values of spiritual, materialistic, human dignity, romance, freedom, futuwwa and Barnett's Liking of Children Scale and that social, career and intellectual values shows difference according to gender. It has been found that there is significant difference according to the department only in the values of human dignity, and there is not significant difference in social, career, intellectual, spiritual, materialistic, romantic, freedom, futuwwa values and points obtained from Barnett Child Love Scale. According to age variable; there is a negative significant relationship between "social" and "career" (values sub-dimensions); a positive significant relationship between "romantic" (values sub-dimension). It was found through regression analysis that subscales of "social", "career", "intellectual", "spiritual", "human dignity", "freedom" and "futuwwa" values are important predictors of teacher candidates' liking of children attitudes.

When the related literature is examined, findings are found to support the results of the research. In a research conducted by Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli and Çıkkılı (2008), looking at the findings obtained by examining the value perceptions of teacher candidates in terms of different variables, it is found that there is a difference between genders in terms of universality, self-direction and power values. According to Yapıcı and Zengin (2003), the process of training women and the expectation of the population make them prefer universality, benevolence, harmony and security values more than men. The main tasks expected from women are being emotional, collaborative, caring and interested. It is emphasized that men should act independently, represent the family and be competitive (Temel & Aksoy, 2001).

As a result of Sarıcı Bulut's (2012) survey, used the values of the students according to their gender were found to differ in terms of benevolence, stimulation, conformity, and security subscales. Male students' stimulation tendencies are higher than female students' stimulation tendencies, whereas female students' benevolence, conformity and security tendencies are higher than male students' benevolence, conformity and security tendencies.

Güngör (2010) argues that the difference in attitude and value perception according to gender does not originate from biological differences, but is due to cultural differences. According to the understanding and roles that society imposes on women and men, gender perception also changes.

In the study conducted by Altunay and Yalçınkaya (2011) and Oğuz (2012), when the values according to the gender of the teacher candidates are compared, it is observed that the female teacher candidates give more importance to all the value dimensions compared to the male teacher candidates.

Özkul (2007) stated that gender has no effect on life values in the research that he conducted. In the research conducted by Yılmaz, Avcıoğlu and Deniz (2010) and in which the value preferences of teacher candidates are examined, it was stated that there is no differentiation between values preferences according to gender.

Turan and Aktan (2008), Keskin and Sağlam (2014) and Yılmaz (2011) also achieved similar results. All these studies have come to the conclusion that demographic variables such as gender and age do not cause a significant differentiation on value preferences.

Taking into consideration the fact that the formation of values coincides with the learning process, it is expected that students come to the university by gaining values in the school and family processes prior to university education. In this direction, Uçar (2009) stated that teachers think that students' learning outcomes related to values are inadequate and that more objectives related to values should be included in the curricula.

As a result, human beings as their creation requirements tend to be more sensitive to the things/people whom he/she appreciates and cares about. Because of the nature of being just "human", children who are "valuable" deserve in fact worthy of attention and felt precious.

Child psychologists called the love shown to children as "growth vitamins". Because, as a result of their research and examination, they have seen that neither all kinds of physical environment provided for the child, nor the demonstrated care do not hold the place of love.

It is now a well-known fact that the reason of physical and mental stress seen in children in child-rearing homes, despite all the physical needs being met, is that they cannot feel parental love. On the other hand, there is a big role of the love which he/she feels or does not feel for the socialization of the child. When these realities are considered, it is obvious how important it is for children to be loving and caring by adults.

References

- Akbaş, O. (2004). *Türk milli eğitim sisteminin duyuşsal amaçlarının ilköğretim II. kademedede gerçekleştirilme derecesinin değerdendirilmesi*. (Unpressed doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Educational Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Altunay E. & Yalçınkaya M. (2011). Öğretmen Adaylarının Bilgi Toplumunda Değere İlişkin Görüşlerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*. 17 (1), 5-28.
- Aydın, İ. P. (2001). *Yönetel, Mesleki ve Örgütsel Etik*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Aydın, M. Z. (2010). *Okulda Çalışan Herkesin Görevi Olarak Değere Eğitim*. [Online] Available: http://www.sanliurfaegitim.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=225:okulda-calisan-herkesin-goerev-olarak-deerler-etm&catid=72:makaleler&Itemid=125 (14/03/13)
- Balcı, F. A. & Yanpar Yelken, T. (2010). İlköğretim Öğretmenlerinin "Değer" Kavramına Yükdedikleri Anlamlar. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 39, 81-90. (SSCI)
- Barnett, M. A. ve Sinisi, C. S. (1990). The Inital Validation of a Liking of Children Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 55(1&2): 161-167.
- Beyazkürk, D. & Kesner, J. E. (2005). Teacher-child relationships in Turkish and United States schools: A cross-cultural study. *International Education Journal*, 6(5), 547-554.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2002). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı*. Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık.
- Cafo, Z. & Somuncuoğlu, D. (2000). *Global values in education and character education* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 449 449).
- Dilmaç, B., Bozgeyikli, H. & Çıkkılı, Y. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değer algılarının farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Değere Eğitim Dergisi*, 6(16), 65-92.
- Dilmaç, B. & Arıca, O.T. (2012). *Değere Ölçeği Geçerlilik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması*. Proceeding at 2.International Values and Education Symposium. Istanbul, Turkey, 16-18 November 2012.
- Downing, J. E., Ryndak, D. L., ve Clark, D. (2000). Paraeducators in inclusive classrooms: Their own perceptions. *Remedial and Special education*, 21, 171-181.
- Dökmen, Ü. (2005). *Küçük şeyler* (2.baskı) İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.
- Dunlop, F. (1996). *Democratic values and the foundations of political education. Values in education and education in values* (Ed. J.M. Halstead ve M.J. Taylor). London: Falmer Pres.
- Duyan, V. & Gelbal, S. (2008). Barnett Çocuk Sevmeye Ölçeği'ni Türkçeye Uyarlama Çalışması. *Education and Science*. 33(148): 40-48.
- Durmuşoğlu Saltalı, N. & Erbay, F. (2013). Okul Öncesi Öğretmenlerinin Konuşma, Dinleme ve Empati Becerilerinin Çocuk Sevmeye Davranışı Açısından İncelenmesi. *Ahi Evran Üniversitesi Kırşehir Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (KEFAD)* Cilt 14, Sayı 1, Nisan 2013, Sayfa 159-174.
- Gelbal, S. & Duyan, V. (2010). İlköğretim Öğretmenlerinin Çocuk Sevmeye Durumlarına Etki Eden Değişkenlerin İncelenmesi. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*. 38: 127-137.
- Güngör, E. (2010). *Değere Psikolojisi Üzerine Araştırmalar*. İstanbul: Ötügen Neşriyat.

- Howes, C. (2000). Socio-emotional classroom climate in child care, child-teacher relationships and children's second grade peer relations. *Social Development*, 9 (2), 191-204.
- Hofstede, G. (1991). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences In Work-Related Values*, Sage Publications, Abridged Edition, seventh printing.
- İşcan Demirhan, C. & Senemoğlu N. (2009). Effectiveness of Values Education Curriculum for the Fourth Grades. *Education and Science*, Cilt: 34, Sayı: 153, 1-14.
- İşcan Demirhan, C. (2011). Values Education and Some Suggestions to Teachers. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, Sayı: 40, 245-255.
- Justice, L.M., Cottone, E.A., Mashburn, A., & Rimm-Kaufman, S.E. (2008). Relationships between teachers and preschoolers who are at risk: contribution of children's language skills, temperamentally based attributes, and gender authors. *Early Education & Development*, 19 (4), July 600 – 621.
- Kan Ç. (2010). Sosyal bilgiler dersi ve değerler eğitimi. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 187,138–145.
- Mete, Ö.L. (2005). *Çocuk Dövme Virüsü*. [Online] Available: <http://arsiv.sabah.com.tr/2005/10/28/yaz57.40.124.html> (12.10.2007)
- Keskin, U. & Sağlam, H. İ. (2014). Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının İnsani Değerlere Sahip olma Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. *Sakarya University Journal Of Education*, 4(1), 81-101.
- Murray, C., & Greenberg, M. T. (2000). Children's relationships with teachers and bonds with school: An investigations of patterns and correlates in middle childhood. *Journal of School Psychology*, 38 (5), 423-445.
- Oğuz, E. (2012). Öğretmen Adaylarının Değerler ve Değerler Eğitime İlişkin Görüşleri. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri*, 12 (2), 1309-1325.
- Onur, B. (2007). *Çocuk, tarih ve toplum*. Ankara: İmge Kitabevi.
- Özkul, A. S. (2007). *Yaşam ve Çalışma Değerlerini Etkileyen Faktörler SDÜ Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma*. Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü: Isparta.
- Pianta, R.C., & La Paro, K. (2003). *Improving early school success*. Educational Leadership, April, 24-29.
- Reuben, J. A. (1996). *The making of the modern university: Intellectual transformation and the marginalization of morality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Pres.
- Rudasill, K. M. (2011). *Child temperament, teacher-child interactions, and teacher-child relationships: A longitudinal investigation from first to third grade*. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 26 (2), 147-156.
- Sarıcı Bulut, S. (2012). Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Değer Yönelimleri. *Uluslararası Türkçe Edebiyat Kültür Eğitim Dergisi* Sayı: 1/3 2012 S. 216-238.
- Temel, Z. F., & Aksoy A. B. (2001). *Ergen ve gelişimi: yetişkinliğe ilk adım*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Tillich, P. (1960). *Love, power and justice: Ontological analyses and ethical applications*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Turan, S. & Aktan, D. (2008). Okul Hayatında Var Olan ve Olması Düşünülen Sosyal Değerler. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6 (2), 227-259.
- Uçar S. (2009). *Sosyal Bilgiler Programındaki Değerlerle İlgili Kazanımlara Yönelik Öğretmen Görüşlerinin Değerlendirilmesi*, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Çukurova Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.
- Yalar, T. & Yanpar Yelken, T. (2011). Değerler Eğitiminin İyileştirilmesi ile İlgili Öğretmen Görüşlerinin Belirlenmesi ve Bir Program Modülü Örneğinin Geliştirilmesi. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*. 10(38), 80-98.
- Yapıcı, A., & Zengin, S. Z. (2003). İlahiyat fakültesi öğrencilerinin değer tercih sıralamaları üzerine psikolojik bir araştırma: Çukurova Üniversitesi İlahiyat Fakültesi örneği. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 1(4), 173–206.
- Yalın, H. İ. (2008). *Öğretim teknolojileri ve materyal geliştirme*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Yaşaroğlu, C. (2013). Hayat Bilgisi Kazanımlarının Değerler Eğitimi Açısından İncelenmesi. *Turkish Studies*, 8 (7), 849-858 <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.4838>
- Yılmaz, E., Avşaroğlu, S. & Deniz, M. (2010). An Investigation of Value Preferences of Teacher Candidates. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (2) ,4943–4948.
- Yılmaz, K. (2011). Eğitim Fakültelerinin Sosyal Sorumluluğu ve Toplum Hizmet Uygulamaları Dersi: Nitel Bir Araştırma. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim Dergisi*, 4 (2), 86-108.