



## Comparison of Value Perceptions of French and Turkish Secondary School Students \*

Cemil Öztürk <sup>1</sup>, Tuğba Kafadar <sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

In the present study, the aim was to compare the value perceptions of the 7th and 8th grade students of the French and Turkish schools. The study was designed in line with the phenomenology, which is one of the qualitative research methods; and the students were determined according to the criterion sampling method, which is one of the purposeful sampling methods. The data that were obtained in the study were analyzed with the descriptive analysis technique. According to the results of the study, the students of both schools explained the value concept as the care given for something, cost and worth, which were similar in both schools. About this explanation, the students of the French school stated values that were more various. The students of both schools frequently mentioned universalism-concern, and the students of the Turkish school rarely mentioned power-dominance; and the students of the French school stated that people should have values in universalism-nature categories. In priority of values and in universal value perceptions, the students of both schools stated many similar and different values.

### Keywords

Value  
Values education  
France  
Turkey  
Comparative education

### Article Info

Received: 03.27.2018  
Accepted: 11.06.2018  
Online Published: 02.13.2019

DOI: 10.15390/EB.2019.7837

### Introduction

Human beings preferred to live in communities since ancient times until our present time. Individuals who live as communities have several cultural structures of their own. In addition to the common culture of a society, there might be different cultural structures in the same society depending on the different properties of the members of the society. One of the basic elements that constitute culture is values. Values are the basic beliefs, principles and standards that define which behavior is right and which one is wrong (Halstead, 2006). Values are the elements that ensure the continuance of societies and play merger roles among the individuals to develop positive attitudes and behaviors.

Values are the concepts used to represent our targets in mental terms; and are desired in social terms. When considered in an evolutionary viewpoint, these targets and the values that express them have vital importance (Schwartz, 2015). According to Schwartz and Bilsky (1987, 1990) values have 5 features. a) Either opinions or beliefs, b) the acceptable results of human behaviors or a situation, c) overcoming of a certain situation, d) guiding in the evaluation or selection of human behaviors and situations, e) rank according to the importance level in a relative manner (as cited in Schwartz, 1992).

\* A part of this study is presented as verbal statement during the 5th International Social Studies Education Symposium.

<sup>1</sup> Marmara University, Atatürk Faculty of Education, Turkish and Social Sciences Education, Turkey, [cozturk@marmara.edu.tr](mailto:cozturk@marmara.edu.tr)

<sup>2</sup> Marmara University, Institute of Educational Sciences, Social Studies Teacher Education, Turkey, [tugbakafadar@gmail.com](mailto:tugbakafadar@gmail.com)

Values are classified in various forms in the literature. One of the authors that made the first classification in the field of values was Spranger (1928), and he defined values with scientific, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious elements (as cited in Akbaş, 2004). Rokeach (1973) defined values as the main (purpose) and intermediary values; Schwartz (1992) defined values as *self-direction, stimulation, hedonism, achievement, power, universalism, benevolence, security, conformity* and *tradition*, which makes a total of 10 dimensions. Schwartz et al. (2012) categorized values under 4 dimensions as *self-enhancement, openness to change, self-transcendence* and *conservation*. In addition to this, these dimensions are divided further into 19 value types as *face, power-resources, power-dominance, success, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction-action, self-direction-thought, universalism-tolerance, universalism-nature, universalism-concern, benevolence-dependability, benevolence-caring, humility, conformity-interpersonal, conformity-rules, tradition, security-societal* and *security-personal*. In the classification that was developed by Schwartz et al. (2012), value types are located in a circular plane with motivational similarities to each other. The motivational value types are located in nearer areas to each other in this circumferential plane; however, the opposite motivational value types are in opposite areas, and the types that are not associated with each other are in remote locations. Ülken (2001) categorized values into three groups as transcendent, innate and normative. As it may be understood from these explanations, common values may exist among the individuals that constitute the society as well as the differentiation among the societies and within the societies, and there might also be differentiations and similarities among the value perceptions of individuals and the values that adopt. As a matter of fact, according to Ülken (2001), each society and each culture has their own values.

There have been cultural differences in almost each society and among societies throughout the history. Today, this situation has not changed. France and Turkey, which are the subject of this study, have cultural variety. France is among the countries that established the Western civilization and played important roles in the spread of its values throughout the world. Since the political reforms announced in the Ottoman State, France has been one of the countries that had the highest influence on the development of the modern educational system in Turkey. According to Ergün (1990, p. 458), France was taken as the model in the general structure of *“the educational system that was established following this period. The French influence continued in education laws and regulations, and in the curricula of the schools. German, English and American education systems also had impacts on Turkish education; however, the structure and the spirit of the French influence, which were established in the Ottoman period, are still not changed today”*. This situation poses the reason why these two countries were preferred in this study. Depending on the different cultural structures of these two countries, there are similarities and differences between the values adopted by the individuals of these societies.

Values may be acquired by individuals in families, at schools, and in social life. School, which is the basic institution in which education and training are given to individuals, is also among the most important places where values are also acquired by individuals. Values may be taught through many lessons directly or indirectly. Values education is provided as a separate lesson under the name of moral-citizenship education in the French education system. In the Turkish education system, on the other hand, values education is not provided as a separate lesson; however, it is integrated together with many other lessons. According to Halstead (1996), values are in the very center of the practices at schools both in theoretical and practical manner. In addition, schools are the areas where values are reflected and lives in the society. In this study, the purpose was to determine and compare the value perceptions of French and Turkish students.

Comparative education studies are the clues of the educational theory, which deals with the analysis and interpretation of the educational practices and policies in different cultures and countries. Curiosity about other cultures and understanding the relation between the educational practices of societies have a very important place for the global society in which we live (Alexander, 2001, as cited in Clarkson, 2009). Determining and comparing the value perceptions of the students of these two countries, which had long-term relations, might be important for showing whether there is interaction/influence among countries. In addition, this study has an important place for recognizing different cultures, seeing the value tendencies of today's individuals, reviewing value education systems of countries, and for facilitating individuals to see the present conditions of value education clearly in comparison with other countries.

When the relevant literature is reviewed, it is seen that the publications on value education are increasing. When we consider these publications in categorical terms, it is observed that these studies were conducted on the value priorities of individuals from different cultures (Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et al., 2001), value preferences of educational administrators (Begley & Leonard, 2005; Haydon, 2007), value preferences of teacher candidates and the relation with some variables (Dilmaç, Bozgeyikli, & Çıkkılı, 2008; Oğuz, 2012; Çalışkan, Sapmaz, & Uzunkol, 2015), value tendencies of teachers (Kuşdil & Kağıtçıbaşı, 2000), value education provided at schools (Halstead, 1996; Huitt, 2004; Doğanay, 2006; Paterson, 2010; Ekşi & Katılmış, 2016; Lovat, Toomey, & Clement 2010; Çengelci, 2010), program development (Katılmış, 2010), scale development and adoption (Çalışkan & Sağlam, 2012; Çalışkan & Karademir, 2014), the efficacy of value education curricula (Demirhan İşcan, 2007), organizing the contents of social studies curriculum and text books in terms of national and universal values (Evin & Kafadar (2004). However, when we consider the relevant literature in terms of comparative education, it is seen that the studies were conducted mostly on examining the social studies curricula of different countries in terms of value education (Kafadar, Öztürk, & Katılmış, 2018) or, on determining the important values of some countries (Turkey, the USA) (Baloğlu Ugurlu, 2014), which means a limited scope for this field. However, in the present study, the value perceptions of the students of the schools that belong to two different countries are examined in detail. Therefore, this research is expected to contribute to the field at a significant level.

### *The Purpose of the Study*

The general purpose of the present study is to determine the value perceptions of the 7th and 8th grade students of the Turkish and French school, which has the French educational system, and which is located in Turkey, and investigate the results in a comparative manner. Answers for the following questions were sought in the study.

- What does the “value” concept evoke according to the 7th and 8th grade students of the French and Turkish school in a comparative manner?
- Which values should we have according to the 7th and 8th grade students of the French and Turkish school in a comparative manner?
- What are the first ten value preferences of the 7th and 8th grade students of the French and Turkish school in a comparative manner?
- What are the universal values according to the 7th and 8th grade students of the French and Turkish school in a comparative manner?

## **Method**

### *The Study Design*

This study was designed in line with the phenomenology, which is one of the qualitative research designs, which gives us the opportunity to define, analyze and make different sense of the phenomena happening more or less in the social world (Van Maanen, 1979 as cited in Merriam, 2009). In the present study, the phenomenology design, which is among the qualitative research designs, was preferred to investigate the value perceptions of the French and Turkish school students in detail and in a comparative manner. The phenomenology design, which is the conscious experience of the living worlds of people (Merriam, 2009) focuses on the “*phenomena which we are aware of but do not have a detailed and deep understanding. Phenomena may appear before us in various forms like events, experiences, perceptions, inclinations, concepts and situations in the world we live. Phenomenology poses the proper research ground for studies that aim to investigate the phenomena with which we are not completely alien and which we cannot fully comprehend*” (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011, p. 72).

### *The Study Group*

The study group was determined according to the criterion sampling method, which is one of the purposeful sampling methods. “*In criterion sampling, the basic concept is the studying of all the situations that meet a series of criteria that are defined before*” (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011, p. 112). In this context, the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students of the French and Turkish school were determined as the schools at which the study data would be collected. The French school in Turkey is of a higher socio-economic level. For this

reason, the Turkish school was also chosen from among a higher socio-economic level. As the grades, the 7th and 8th grades were chosen because the secondary school system starts in France at a level which is taken as the 7th grade in Turkey. In addition, in the Turkish education system, secondary school education is completed at the 8th grade. For this reason, the 7th and 8th grades were chosen, which might equal the educational levels in both countries. *51 girls, 49 boys* were chosen from the Turkish school; and *53 girls, 33 boys* were chosen from the French school. The descriptive data of the students of both schools are given below.

**Table 1.** The Distribution of the 7th and 8th Grade French and Turkish School Students According to Nationalities

Nationality	French school			Turkish school		
	7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	f	7 <sup>th</sup>	8 <sup>th</sup>	f
Turkish	17	16	33	52	48	100
French	20	15	35	-	-	-
Algerian	2	-	2	-	-	-
British	1	-	1	-	-	-
Italian	1	-	1	-	-	-
Canadian	1	1	2	-	-	-
Moroccan	2	-	2	-	-	-
American	1	2	3	-	-	-
Swedish	1	-	1	-	-	-
Swiss	1	1	2	-	-	-
Irish	1	-	1	-	-	-
Belgium	-	2	2	-	-	-
German	-	1	1	-	-	-
Total	48	38	86	52	48	100

#### *The Data Collection Tool and Its Development*

The structured interview forms were used as the study data were collected from the students of the schools of both countries. The interview questions were firstly prepared independently by the researchers according to the scope of the study. Then, the researchers met and discussed the interview questions and combined their questions. The questions which were decided to be not proper were excluded from the study. The interview questions that were prepared were presented specialist viewpoints to (4) specialists of the field and to (2) measurement and evaluation specialists to consider the relevance to the aims of the study; and finally, there were 4 questions in the form.

In the interview method, the forms that consisted of open-ended and closed-ended questions were used. In the first form, there were 3 open-ended questions; and in the second form, there were 1 closed-ended question. Through the closed-ended question included in the form, the purpose was to determine the value priority of the students; and in line with this aim, the educational curricula of the value education or equivalent classes in the relevant countries and in different countries were examined. As a result of this process, and with the literature review, the values list was formed. There were initially 33 values in this values list, and these were presented to specialists for their viewpoints. The (4) field specialists and (2) measurement and evaluation specialists who received the values list made evaluations and decided that 3 values were not proper. The researchers agreed and 30 values were included in the values list. The values in the list were; *love, honesty, trust, rightfulness, justice, tolerance, responsibility, patriotism, patience, industriousness, freedom, helpfulness, peace, self-confidence, equality, caring for the union of the family, being ethical-moral, solidarity, honor, history conscience, secularism, respect, scientificness, respect for differences, sensitivity, saving, courage, equality, democracy and aesthetics.*

### ***The Collection and Analysis of the Data***

The data of the study were collected with the interview method. The reason why the interview method was used was to investigate the value perceptions of the students in detail. Approvals were received from the schools before the study was initiated, and school administrations and relevant teachers were informed about the study by the researchers. The data were collected from the schools of both countries in two steps. Firstly, open-ended questions were asked to the students, and then the closed-ended question, i.e. the value list, was given to the students and they were asked to rank the first 10 values according to their priorities. The reason why this method was employed in data collection was to avoid the effects on their answers to the questions in other questions by making them see the values in the list.

The data that were obtained in the study were analyzed by using the descriptive analysis method. The analysis process was realized in four stages, which were recommended by Yıldırım and Şimşek (2011): (1) *Creating a frame for descriptive analysis*, (2) *processing the data in line with the thematic frame*, (3) *defining the findings*, (4) *interpretation of the findings* (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). The steps during the analysis were as follows:

**Step 1: Creating a frame for descriptive analysis:** The data obtained from the students were associated with the questions and a general frame was created for each question before the analyzes. About the 2<sup>nd</sup> question, the 19-value classification was used, which was reorganized and revised by Schwartz et al. (2012) based on its initial form, and which was considered to be proper after the literature review. According to this value classification, values are classified as *face*, *power-resources*, *power-dominance*, *success*, *hedonism*, *stimulation*, *self-direction-action*, *self-direction-thought*, *universalism-tolerance*, *universalism-nature*, *universalism-concern*, *benevolence-dependability*, *benevolence-caring*, *humility*, *conformity-interpersonal*, *conformity-rules*, *tradition*, *security-societal*, *security-personal*.

**Step 2: Processing the data in line with the thematic frame:** In this step, the data that were obtained from the students were evaluated and a temporary list was created for each question of each value. The value that was considered to be empty or to produce no valid values was excluded from the evaluation. In addition, in this step, when the data were being classified, the examples that would be directly quoted were also chosen.

**Step 3: Defining the findings:** In this step, the data on the 2<sup>nd</sup> question were brought together according to their common characteristics under proper categories. The values that were obtained about the other questions were directly ranked. In addition, direct quotations were made from the chosen examples.

**Step 4: Interpretation of the findings:** In this step, the frequency of the values collected under the categories was determined. Then, the values whose frequencies were determined were defined, interpreted and relevant inferences were made.

### ***Validity and Reliability***

In order to increase the quality in a qualitative study, Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommended some strategies (as cited in Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). In this context, the proceedings for validity and reliability are as follows.

When the interview form, which was used in the data collection stage of the present study, was developed, the relevant literature was reviewed to ensure its content validity. Then, the questions, which were created by the researchers independently from each other, were combined. Then these questions were asked to specialists. After the viewpoints of the specialists, the final forms were given to the questions, and the reliability of the questions was computed as 0.80 according to the agreement and disagreement coefficients of Miles and Huberman (1994). The value list in the study questions were firstly prepared by the researchers, and specialist viewpoints were received for them. The reliability of the value list was computed as 0.90 according to the agreement and disagreement coefficients of Miles and Huberman (1994).

After the data of the study were collected, the researchers met firstly separately, then together and discussed the findings. The researchers then had consensus on the findings. Some of the study findings were analyzed by an outside researcher to determine whether encoding and classification were made accurately during the analysis process; and the reliability coefficient was computed. The reliability was computed as 0,89 according to the consensus and dissensus coefficient of Miles and Huberman (1994).

## Results

The students of the French and Turkish schools answered the question “*What does the value concept evoke in you?*” as the importance, worth and cost given to something. Among these definitions, the students of both schools mentioned some values. The values mentioned by the students of both schools are given below in Table 2.

**Table 2.** The Viewpoints of the French and Turkish School 7th and 8th Grade Students on “Value” Concept

The French School	7th grade	8th grade	f	The Turkish School	7th grade	8th grade	f
Love	13	17	30	Respect	16	18	34
Respect	13	10	23	Love	16	17	33
Family	12	8	20	Tolerance	7	12	19
Peace	9	5	14	Peace	5	8	13
Friendship	7	7	14	Trust	4	8	12
Tolerance	7	1	8	Respect for the elderly	4	8	12
Equality	6	1	7	Freedom	6	5	11
Freedom	5	2	7	Family	3	6	9
Trust	2	4	6	Protecting and loving the small ones	2	4	6
Helpfulness	1	5	6	Friendship	3	2	5
Justice	4	1	5	Justice	1	3	4
Honesty	3	2	5	Honesty	-	4	4
Courage	3	-	3	Equality	-	3	3
Righteousness	2	1	3	Respect for differences	3	-	3
Self-confidence	2	1	3	Solidarity	-	3	3
Respect for the elderly	-	3	3	Patriotism	1	1	2
Respect for differences	2	-	2	Self-confidence	1	1	2
Patriotism	2	-	2	Patience	1	1	2
Industriousness	1	1	2	Friendship	-	2	2
Brotherhood	2	-	2	Responsibility	-	2	2
Sharing	2	-	2	Helpfulness	-	2	2
Patience	2	-	2	Religion	1	-	1
Secularism	1	-	1	Sharing	-	1	1
Not betraying	1	-	1	Love for the nature	-	1	1
Religion	1	-	1	Good manners	1	-	1
Solidarity	1	-	1	Ethics	1	-	1
Basic rules	1	-	1	Sensitivity	-	1	1
Happiness	1	-	1	Historical values	-	1	1

**Table 2.** Continued

The French School	7th grade	8th grade	f	The Turkish School	7th grade	8th grade	f
Courtesy	1	-	1	Being together and unity	-	1	1
Memory	1	-	1	Language	-	1	1
Friendship	1	-	1	The flag	-	1	1
Responsibility	1	-	1	National anthem	-	1	1
Love for one's job	-	1	1	Respect for different ideas	-	1	1
Love for the nature	-	1	1	Communication	-	1	1
Good manners	-	1	1				
Being scientific	-	1	1				
Protecting	-	1	1				

The findings on the question “*What does the value concept evoke in you?*” are as follows: It was determined that the French school ( $f_{37}$ ) and the students of the Turkish school students ( $f_{34}$ ) had different statements in terms of values. The students of the French school, frequently mentioned *love, respect, family, peace, friendship* and rarely *secularism, not betraying, religion, solidarity, basic rules, happiness, courtesy, memory, friendship, responsibility, love for one's job, love for the nature, good manners, being scientific* and *protecting* values. The Turkish school students frequently mentioned *respect, love, tolerance, peace,* and rarely *religion, sharing, love for the nature, good manners, ethics, sensitivity, historical values, being together and unity, language, flag, national anthem, respect for different ideas* and *communication*.

For example, the direct quotations of some students in the question “*What does the term “value” evoke in you?*” are as follows.

The students of the French school:

**F-7-E-39:** “*For me, values ensure that the World turns better. Values are the indicators of the personality of a person. The most important values for me are love, friendship, religion and respect.*” **F-7-E-41:** “*Honesty, because people lied to me and cheated me many times in my life, I cannot trust them. They were my friends, and I loved them, but I cannot live with people I do not trust.*” **F-7-K-37:** “*When value is mentioned, I recall family. I think family is more valuable than anything else. As long as we have families, I think that we may stand on our feet. Family is a great value. There are many smaller values within the family value. When you have a family, you have trust, respect, honesty and love for other people. Love and family are the most important things for me, for example, when my brother was born, it was one of the happiest days of my life.*” **F-7-K-26:** “*I always care intensely for everything. But, two different issues are intense in my heart. The first one is the family, and the other one is friends. Unfortunately, I could never see my family together. We moved when I was 4 years old... I had started to learn to love. 2 years later, my grandfather passed away, and a few years later my mother and father divorced. My family was in pieces. For this reason, I could not feel family love much. I filled this gap with the love of my friends.*” **F-7-E-16:** “*For me, value is the feeling, sense and importance given to an object or a person.*” **F-8-K-28:** “*Value is the indicator of the importance given to any creature. It is an emotional indicator for an object that exists in our imagination or that exists actually in the world or in the universe. For example, if someone is committing a suicide before our eyes, and if you care for him/her, you stop him/her or want to stop. Value is generally given to objects or to living things. Most of the time, value is confused with love. But this is a very big mistake because if it is a person that confuses these feelings, you are in serious trouble.*”

When the direct quotations received from the French school students are interpreted, the student with the code **F-7-E-39** said that values reflected the personality of a person, and made the earth turn in a better way, and the most important values were love, friendship, religion and respect. The

student with the code **F-7-E-41** said that the most important value was honesty, the student with the code **F-7-K-37** said that family was the most important value, and as long as the family existed, one could stand on his/her feet, and based on the family, the values trust, courage, respect, honesty and love could exist in people. The student with the code **F-7-K-26** said that value was important for himself/herself, s/he cared for many things; however, the most important values for him/her were family and friendship. Because of the deaths and separations in his/her family, s/he could not receive the love of a family, and for this reason, he replaced the love of a family with the love of a friend, and considered these important. The student with the code **F-7-E-16** said that value was the feeling and importance for an object or a person, the student with the code **F-8-K-28** said that value was the indicator for an entity, for example, the importance given to something increased the interest in it and love and caring were two different concepts, and they should not be confused.

The students of the Turkish school:

**T-7-K-51:** "The term "value" evokes in me many concepts like respect, love, tolerance etc. Value is one of the most important things that must be given to a human. When one cares for another, that person becomes happy. Some people belittle other people by seeing them below their level. In other words, they do not care for them. If you care for someone, be sure that they will care for you someday." **T-8-K-21:** "Value evokes firstly love and respect for me. For example, my mother's showing the same love to me and my sister. Value evokes trust for me. For example, if you do not trust in your boyfriend, what is the importance of friendship?" **T-8-K-26:** "The term value evokes trust, love, solidarity for me and the importance I give to my beloved ones." **T-8-K-41:** "Value shows love, respect, trust and importance for a person. Love for someone evokes these feelings in them." **T-8-K-18:** "Value shows the respect for a person, the respect shown for people indicates that friendship and love have a value for humans. If a person is loved much, we prove that how much s/he is valuable for us by doing something for him/her."

When the direct quotations received from the Turkish school students are interpreted, the student with the code **T-7-K-51** said that value evoked respect, love, tolerance and similar concepts, value was important, and it was the level of the care given by a person for another person. In addition, s/he mentioned that caring made one happy. The students with the code **T-8-K-21** said that value evoked love, respect and trust, and value was the importance given to something, the students with the code **T-8-K-26** said that value meant trust, love, solidarity, and value was the importance given to people. The student with the code **T-8-K-41** said that value meant love, respect, trust and the importance given to humans; the students with the code **T-8-K-18** said that value was the respect for a person, and respect, love and friendship were values.

**Table 3.** Which Values Should We Have According to the French and Turkish School 7th and 8th Grade Students?

Categories	Values	The French school			The Turkish school			
		7th grade	8th grade	f	7th grade	8th grade	f	f
<b>Face</b>	Honor	7	4	11	8	17	25	36
<b>Power-resources</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Power-dominance</b>	Law	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Powerfulness	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
<b>Success</b>	Industriousness	12	9	21	14	20	34	55
	Being scientific	7	5	12	8	11	19	31
	Logic	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Success	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
<b>Hedonism</b>	Aesthetics	5	6	11	7	10	17	28
<b>Stimulation</b>	Courage	22	17	39	16	29	45	84



Table 3. Continued

Categories	Values	The French school			The Turkish school			
		7th grade	8th grade	f	7th grade	8th grade	f	f
<b>Self-direction-action</b>	Interpretation	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
	Criticizing	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
	Freedom in decision-making	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Freedom	25	12	37	17	24	41	78
	Autonomy	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
<b>Self-direction-thoughts</b>	Self-confidence	21	14	35	16	22	38	73
	Skills	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
<b>Universalism-tolerance</b>	Respect for differences	25	14	39	10	18	28	67
	Respect	28	18	46	23	22	55	101
	Tolerance	12	5	17	17	27	44	61
	Not humiliating people-	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
	Exchange of ideas	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
<b>Universalism-nature</b>	Being in integrity with the nature	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
<b>Universalism-concern</b>	Justice	25	17	42	19	20	39	81
	Sensitivity	5	6	11	14	16	30	41
	Equality	29	19	48	17	27	44	92
	Peace	26	15	41	18	20	38	79
	Democracy	15	16	31	15	23	38	69
	Secularism	9	6	15	25	16	41	56
<b>Benevolence-dependability</b>	Friendship	5	3	8	2	2	4	12
	Friendship	-	-	-	2	-	2	2
	Honesty	25	16	41	17	29	46	87
	Trust	23	13	36	18	29	47	83
	Righteousness	18	11	29	16	27	43	72
	Being ethical-having moral values	9	5	14	7	13	20	34
	Brotherhood	-	1	1	2	-	2	3
<b>Benevolence-caring</b>	Sharing	1	-	1	1	-	1	2
	Responsibility	25	19	44	21	28	49	93
	Helpfulness	28	16	44	19	26	45	89
	Love	11	10	21	22	23	55	76
	Generosity	-	-	-	-	4	4	4
	Benevolence	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Mercy	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Empathy	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Forgiving	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Sacrifice	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Helping the little ones	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	<b>Humility</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Conformity-interpersonal</b>	Patience	15	7	22	12	21	33	55
	Being careful	-	-	-	-	4	4	4

Table 3. Continued

Categories	Values	The French school			The Turkish school			
		7th grade	8th grade	f	7th grade	8th grade	f	f
Conformity-rules Tradition	Courtesy	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
	Respect for the elderly	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Consulting	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
	Being planned	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Culture	-	-	-	-	2	2	2
	Our customs and traditions	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
	Historical places	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
	Historical personage	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Religion	2	-	2	1	3	4	6
Security-societal	Faith	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Saving	15	4	19	9	11	20	39
	Being together and unity	1	-	1	-	2	2	3
	Devotedness	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
	Communication	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Patriotism	9	12	21	20	23	43	64
	The flag	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	Populism	-	-	-	1	-	1	1
	National anthem	1	-	1	-	-	-	1
	Security-personal	Love for the family union	24	7	31	15	24	39
Solidarity		14	5	19	14	18	32	39

The findings obtained from the 7th and 8th grade students of the French and Turkish schools about the "Which values should we have?" were analyzed based on the value classification developed by Schwartz et al. (2012) and the findings are given in Table 3.

When the data obtained from the students of the French and Turkish school students were analyzed according to the value types that were developed by Schwartz et al. (2012), the following findings were determined. The French school students often mentioned *universalism-concern* (f188) and *benevolence-dependability* (f129), *benevolence-caring* (f113), *universalism-tolerance* (f102), *security-personal* (f50), *security-societal* (f43), *stimulation* (f39), *self-direction-action* (f38), *self-direction-thought* (f36), *success* (f34), *conformity-interpersonal* (f22), *face* (f11), *hedonism* (f11), *tradition* (f2) and rarely *universalism-nature* (f1) categories; and values were not mentioned in the *power-resources*, *power-dominance*, *humility*, *conformity-rules* categories were not mentioned. The Turkish school students frequently mentioned *universalism-concern* (f230) and then *benevolence-dependability* (f164), *benevolence-caring* (f157), *universalism-tolerance* (f130), *security-personal* (f71), *security-societal* (f68), *success* (f54), *stimulation* (f45), *self-direction-action* (f44), *conformity-interpersonal* (f42), *self-direction-thought* (f38), *face* (f36), *hedonism* (f17), *tradition* (f10) and rarely *power-dominance* (f2), categories, respectively; and no values were mentioned in the *power-resources*, *universalism-nature*, *humility* and *conformity-rules* categories.

When the categories mentioned often and rarely by the students of both schools were examined in a comparative manner, it was determined that the students of both schools often mentioned *universalism-concern*, and French school students rarely mentioned *universalism-nature*, and Turkish school students mentioned values in the *power-dominance* category.

**Table 4.** The First 10 Value Preferences of the French and Turkish School 7th and 8th Grade Students

The French school	7th grade	8th grade	f	The Turkish school	7th grade	8th grade	f
Equality	35	22	57	Love	46	41	87
Freedom	32	21	53	Honesty	46	29	75
Peace	29	24	53	Trust	36	33	69
Love	28	21	49	Righteousness	28	22	50
Responsibility	21	22	43	Justice	24	26	50
Justice	24	18	42	Tolerance	24	26	50
Love for the family union	27	14	41	Responsibility	26	19	45
Honesty	20	19	39	Patriotism	27	15	42
Trust	28	11	39	Patience	13	26	39
Helpfulness	19	20	39	Industriousness	21	15	36
Self-confidence	19	13	32	Freedom	19	15	35
Righteousness	19	11	30	Helpfulness	19	13	32
Courage	11	15	26	Peace	18	14	32
Patience	11	15	26	Self-confidence	15	15	30
Secularism	9	14	23	Equality	15	17	32
Industriousness	6	12	18	Love for the family union	12	14	26
Solidarity	15	3	18	Ethics/being ethical	9	12	21
Honor	8	5	13	Solidarity	8	6	14
Patriotism	8	2	10	Honor	6	8	14
Tolerance	5	4	9	The conscious of history	1	5	6
Ethics/being ethical	5	2	7	Secularism	-	5	5
The conscious of history	3	1	4	Respect	-	-	-
Respect	-	-	-	Being scientific	-	-	-
Being scientific	-	-	-	Respect for differences	-	-	-
Respect for differences	-	-	-	Sensitivity	-	-	-
Sensitivity	-	-	-	Saving	-	-	-
Saving	-	-	-	Courage	-	-	-
Democracy	-	-	-	Democracy	-	-	-
Aesthetics	-	-	-	Aesthetics	-	-	-

The findings obtained with the question “How are the first 10 value preferences of the Turkish and French school 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students?” are given in Table 4.

According to the findings of the study, the French school, on the other hand, prioritized value *equality, freedom, peace, love, responsibility, justice, love for the family union, honesty, trust, helpfulness, self-confidence, righteousness, courage, patience, secularism, industriousness, solidarity, honor, patriotism, tolerance, ethics/being ethical, the conscious of history* values and did not mention *respect, being scientific, respect for differences, sensitivity, saving, democracy, and aesthetics* values. Turkish school students prioritized value *love, honesty, trust, righteousness, justice, tolerance, responsibility, patriotism, peace, self-confidence, love for the family union, ethics/being ethical, solidarity, honor, the conscious of history, secularism* values; and did not mention *respect, being scientific, respect for differences, sensitivity, saving, courage, equality, democracy, aesthetics* values.

The *love, honesty, trust, righteousness, justice, tolerance, responsibility, patriotism, patience, Industriousness, freedom, helpfulness, peace, self-confidence, equality, caring for the family union, being ethical-having moral values, solidarity, honor, history conscience and secularism* values were determined in the

students of both schools. *Respect, scientificness, respect for differences, sensitivity, saving, democracy, esthetic values* were not mentioned in the value priorities of both schools.

How are the universal value perceptions of French and Turkish school 7th and 8th grade students? The findings on this question are given in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Universal Value Perception of French and Turkish School 7th and 8th Grade Students

The French school	7th grade	8th grade	f	The Turkish school	7th grade	8th grade	f
Equality	31	27	58	Respect	37	32	69
Peace	31	26	57	Love	34	29	63
Respect	31	25	56	Responsibility	24	21	45
Justice	28	23	51	Trust	33	25	58
Freedom	26	23	49	Tolerance	29	27	56
Helpfulness	28	20	48	Helpfulness	28	27	55
Responsibility	31	15	46	Equality	27	26	53
Love	21	23	44	Justice	25	28	53
Honesty	27	17	44	Honesty	27	24	51
Respect for differences	24	18	42	Patriotism	28	20	48
Trust	20	20	40	Righteousness	28	19	47
Courage	21	19	40	Courage	25	22	47
Secularism	15	21	36	Patience	24	22	46
Love for the family union	22	13	34	Self-confidence	22	22	44
Self-confidence	18	15	33	Freedom	24	18	42
Righteousness	14	18	32	Solidarity	20	20	40
Patience	13	17	30	Respect for differences	17	21	38
Industriousness	15	15	30	Democracy	18	20	38
Solidarity	20	9	29	Ethics/being ethical	19	17	36
Patriotism	14	13	27	Sensitivity	15	16	31
Democracy	13	14	27	Industriousness	19	11	30
Saving	11	14	25	Love for the family union	16	14	30
Honor	16	7	23	Saving	11	12	23
Being scientific	11	9	20	Honor	15	5	20
Tolerance	9	10	19	Being scientific	11	6	17
Sensitivity	8	11	19	Secularism	15	1	16
Ethics/being ethical	9	9	18	Aesthetics	8	1	9
Skills	4	7	11	Brotherhood	3	-	3
Protecting the nature	2	3	5	Love	2	-	2
Aesthetics	1	2	3	Customs and traditions	-	2	2
Generosity	-	1	1	Keeping our environment clean	1	-	1
Optimism	1	-	1	Respect for different cultures	1	-	1
Sharing	1	-	1	Freedom of settlement and travel	1	-	1
Success	1	-	1	The flag	1	-	1
Pride	1	-	1	Beliefs	-	1	1
Logic	1	-	1	Our foods	-	1	1
	1	-	1	Our songs	-	1	1

According to table 5, the findings on the universal value perceptions of the 7th and 8th grade students of the French and Turkish schools are as follows. The students of the French school mentioned frequently *equality, peace, respect, justice, freedom, helpfulness and responsibility*, and rarely mentioned *generosity, optimism, sharing, success, pride and logic* values. The Turkish school students frequently mentioned *respect, love, responsibility, trust, tolerance, helpfulness, equality, justice, honesty* and rarely mentioned *keeping our environment clean, respect for different cultures, freedom for settlement and travel, the flag, beliefs, our foods, and our songs* values.

The values *equality, justice, helpfulness and responsibility* were frequently preferred in the universal value perceptions of the students of both schools. While *peace* and *freedom* came to the forefront in French school students, it was not mentioned in the statements of the Turkish school students. In addition, the *freedom* value was mentioned often in the statements of the Turkish school students and the *peace* value was not mentioned. In addition, the *love, trust, tolerance and honesty* values came to the forefront in the Turkish school students, and were not mentioned by the French school students.

### Discussion, Conclusion and Suggestions

When the value perceptions of the French and Turkish school 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students were evaluated in a comparative manner, the findings of the study are as follows. The students of both schools said the importance, worth and cost given to something as the answer to the question on what the term "value" evoked in them. Similarly, according to the up-to-date dictionary released by the Turkish Language Institution, the value is defined "*as the abstract criterion that is used to determine the importance of something, the remuneration something is worth, cost, price,*" which is similar to the findings of the present study.

The students of both schools stated many values when they were stating their view points on value perceptions. Although the students of the French school stated more various values, the students of both schools also mentioned the same values. The reason why the students of the French school mentioned values that had more variety may be associated with the student structure that included individuals coming from various cultures, because each society has the properties that are specific to it and depending on this, each society has different values. According to Rokeach (1973), "*each culture has values that are specific to it. One may make predictions about the culture, society, institutional structures and personalities by considering these values especially the ones that rank the first*" (as cited in Aydın, 2005, p. 5). The values that were mentioned frequently by the students from both schools were *respect, love and peace*, and they rarely mentioned *religion, love for the nature and good manners*. In both schools, the students mentioned "*respect, love, tolerance, peace, trust, respect for the elderly, freedom, family, friendship, justice, honesty, equality, respect for differences, solidarity, patriotism, self-confidence, patience, responsibility, religion, sharing, love of nature, and nurture*" as an answer to this question. The fact that the students of both schools mentioned the same values about the value concept may show that there is similarity between the value perceptions of the students of two different societies. Although it is possible to associate this result with various reasons, according to Berkes (2010) and Ergün (1990), France was effective on the Turkish modernism for a long time. For this reason, this may stem from the effect of those times. In addition, the French school is located in Turkey. There might be similarities that stem from the fact that both schools are located in the same country although they belong to different countries. It is possible to associate the reason of these similarities with globalization. Because with globalization, one single event that is the issue of one single country may affect almost all the world and the similarities among today's societies increase and similarities are also observed in value perceptions of individuals coming from different cultures.

The Turkish school students mentioned *ethics, sensitivity, historical values, being together and unity, language, the flag, national anthem, communication* values, which is different from the students of the Turkish school; the students of the French school mentioned *courage, righteousness, industriousness, brotherhood, secularism, basic rules, happiness, courtesy, memory, being scientific* which is different from the Turkish school students. The students of the Turkish school mentioned different values, which may be

associated with the national values of the Turkish society. It is noteworthy that the students of the French school mentioned different values because they consisted of students coming from different cultures. In addition, it was also observed that there were concrete reflections of the values in the statements of the students from both schools. Allport, Vernon, & Lindzey (1951) conducted a study on value concept and loaded more concrete meanings that were related with life to the value concept by associating it with reading newspaper, watching a movie, or voting (as cited in Debats & Bartelds, 1996).

Which values should we have? The values for this question were grouped according to the value classification of Schwartz et al. (2012). In this respect, the French school students often mentioned *universalism-concern*, and *benevolence-dependability*, *benevolence-caring*, *universalism-tolerance*, *security-personal*, *security-societal*, *stimulation*, *self-direction-action*, *self-direction-thought*, *success*, *conformity-interpersonal*, *face*, *hedonism*, *tradition*, respectively and rarely, *universalism-nature* categories. The students of the Turkish school often mentioned *universalism-concern*, *benevolence-dependability*, *benevolence-caring*, *universalism-tolerance*, *security-personal*, *security-societal*, *success*, *stimulation*, *self-direction-action*, *conformity-interpersonal*, *self-direction-thought*, *face*, *hedonism*, *tradition* and rarely, *power-dominance* categories. The students of the French and Turkish schools frequently mentioning the values like *universalism-concern* and then *benevolence-dependability*, *benevolence-caring*, *universalism-tolerance*, respectively as very close to each other shows consistency with the circular cycle in the value classification of Schwartz et al. (2012). The findings obtained with the Schwartz value questionnaire and Portrait value questionnaire from 82 countries provide proof for the fact that there are important differences between the value priorities of the individuals and that Schwartz value theory is valid among cultures (Schwartz, 2012). Schwartz theory is related with the basic values that are recognized by people from all cultures. Values are the targets that serve as guiding principles in the lives of people and change according to priority (Rokeach 1973; Kluckhohn, 1951, as cited in Schwartz, 2015). The fact that the students of the schools of both countries often mentioned the values that are in the same category may stem from the interaction between the cultures due to globalization. However, while the values that were rarely mentioned were *power-dominance* at the Turkish school, these were *universalism-nature* at the French school. These results show that there are similarities as well as differences between the value understanding of both countries. The educationalists of different countries in the world suggest many values to be taught to the children in their countries. The educationalists from the South Africa suggest some values that serve to a democratic lifestyle: respect for others, sensitivity to others, thinking flexibility, gratefulness, honesty, loyalty (Steyn et al., 1999, as cited in Zecha, 2007). In the portfolio of the Australian schools, on the other hand, there are values like *care and affection*, *doing one's best*, *being fair*, *freedom*, *reliability*, *respect*, *responsibility* and *tolerance and social participation* to be taught to students (AUGO, 2005, as cited in Zecha, 2007). These findings show that there are same and different value perceptions throughout the world.

On the other hand, the students did not mention the *power-resources*, *power-dominance*, *humility* and *conformity-rules* values in the French school, and did not mention the *power-resources*, *universalism-nature*, *humility*, *conformity-rules* values in the Turkish school. The reason that the students of both schools did not mention any values in the *power-resources* categories, and the students of the Turkish school mentioned less values in *power-dominance* category, and the students of the French school did not mention any values in *power-dominance* category may be associated with the age status of the students. Because the values like *having social power*, *having authority*, and *being rich* might be the values that might be desired in further ages by students. In the study conducted by Kafadar et al. (2018), they investigated the social studies curricula of Turkey and the USA (New York) and the moral-citizenship educational curricula of France in terms of value education, and reported that the *power-resources* value was among the value categories that were not or rarely found in the curricula. It is possible that the values included in this category may be important for adult individuals, and therefore, they may be not included or were included less in the contents of the curricula. For this reason, this may be reflected in the perceptions of the students.

Obtaining similar result from the students of both schools in *stimulation, self-direction-thought, self-direction-action* categories has the quality of supporting the cycle in the value classification of Schwartz et al. (2012). Because Schwartz et al. (2012) classified the value hypothesis side-by-side in the circular cycle. In addition, close results were obtained in the *security-personal* and *security-societal* categories in the results of both schools. Akbaş (2004) reported in his study that students cared more for national security without any gender difference. This finding supports the result of our study.

What are the first ten value preferences of the students of both schools according to priority level? The students stated their first 10 value preferences according to the priority level from among the 30 values. These values; *love, honesty, trust, righteousness, justice, tolerance, responsibility, patriotism, patience, industriousness, freedom, helpfulness, peace, self-confidence, equality, love for the family union, being ethical-having moral values, solidarity, honor, the conscious of history, secularism, respect, being scientific, respect for differences, sensitivity, saving, courage, equality, democracy and aesthetics*. The following were common in the value priorities of the students of both schools; *love, honesty, trust, righteousness, justice, tolerance, responsibility, patriotism, patience, industriousness, freedom, helpfulness, peace, self-confidence, equality, love for the family union, ethics/being ethical, solidarity, honor, the conscious of history and secularism* as the prior values. There were common values in the value priorities of the students of both countries. These results prove the fact that wherever we go on earth, there are common value concepts that are accepted by them for people. In the study conducted by Ryan (1999), it was reported that there are values that meant the same in all societies. For example, the golden rule (i.e. “*not doing the thing you do not want to face to another person*”) exists in all societies. Respect to the existence of others is another universal value (as cited in Akbaş, 2004).

While caring for the *family unity* came to the forefront in the responses of the French school students as their priorities, it was not at the same significance level in Turkish school students. It is possible to associate this with many reasons. The present study was conducted with a limited study group, for this reason, this may stem from the participant groups. As another reason, it may be associated with the student structure of the schools. There are students from many nationalities at the French school. These students are away from their countries and most of them have their families in Turkey. For this reason, they may consider the family unity as their priority values because they live in another country away from their own cultures. In addition, the reason why this value was at the forefront in the French school students may stem from the French educational system. When the fact that one of the most important places where values are adopted by children is school is considered, students may consider this value as their prior value because it is focused on more in the education system, and based on this, in the textbooks and curricula. *Respect, scientificness, respect for differences, sensitivity, sensitivity, saving, democracy and aesthetics* values were not included in the value priorities of the students of these schools. The reason why these values were not included in the value priorities of both schools may be education systems of both countries, and based on this, these values may be included less in educational curricula, textbooks and in education-learning processes.

While *courage* is among the values that were preferred by the students of the French school, the students of the Turkish school did not prefer this value. According to Bartelds and Debats (1995), “*the value of a person that ranks the first in his/her values list may be the basic value of that person. Theoretically, when all the values that are possible to exist are given to a person and if the person is asked to rank them, the value that is placed at the top of the list is the value that is cared at the highest level by that person*” (as cited in Aydın, 2005, pp. 19-20). The values and the hierarchy of the values of a person determine the attitude of the person for a specific object or phenomenon (Akbaş, 2004). In addition, the values that were mentioned by the students of both schools at the priority list commonly because of the fact that they come from different nationalities may be defined as universal values. Although the nature and structure of the values are universal, the importance given by individuals and groups to values vary at a great deal. In other words, individuals and groups have different value priorities or hierarchies. Each individual has many values that have importance at various levels (for example, success, security, helpfulness).

A certain value might be very important for an individual; however, it might be insignificant for another (Schwartz, 2015).

What are the universal values? The common points in the answers of the students of both countries to this question were; *respect, love, responsibility, trust, tolerance, helpfulness, equality, justice, honesty, patriotism, righteousness, courage, patience, self-confidence, freedom, solidarity, respect for differences, democracy, being ethical-having moral values, sensitivity, industriousness, love for the family union, being scientific, secularism and aesthetics*. According to Baloğlu Uğurlu (2014, p. 107), “although there are differences in the value judgments of the individuals from different societies, all societies emphasize similar universal values as a basic line”. In addition, the Turkish school students mentioned *brotherhood, love, customs and traditions, keeping our environment clean, respect for different cultures, freedom of settlement and travel, the flag, beliefs, our foods and our songs* values as the universal values, and the students of the French school mentioned *peace, skills, protecting the nature, generosity, optimism, sharing, success, pride and logic* values, which is different from each other. The values *equality, justice, helpfulness* and *responsibility* were the ones that were mentioned frequently. While *peace* and *freedom* and were the values that came to the forefront in the student of the French school, these were not observed in the statements of the students of the Turkish school. While the *freedom* value was determined in the statements of the students of the Turkish school, the *peace* value was not determined in them. The *love, trust, tolerance, and honesty* values were at the forefront in the statements of the students of the Turkish school, these values were not determined in the statements of the French school students. The reason for these differences is the fact that these two countries have two different societies, and therefore, it is natural that there are small differences in universal value perceptions. As a matter of fact, when the results obtained about the universal values of the Turkish and French school students are considered, these values show similarities at a great deal. According to Taylor (1996), there are many nouns defined as values in many course books, educational brochures and articles. It was reported that the values like respect, justice, loyalty and trust, responsibility and tolerance must be acquired by a school community (as cited in Zecha, 2007). This shows similarity with the values reported in the results of the present study. In this context, many values that were mentioned by the students of both schools may be defined as universal values.

Based on the study findings, the following suggestions may be made:

In the present study, the value perceptions of the French and Turkish schools 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students were investigated. The students of the French school mentioned value concepts with more variety when compared with the students of the Turkish school. Educational programs, textbooks and school activities may be enhanced to increase the value connotations of the students of Turkish schools. The students of the French school mentioned values with a less frequency in universalism-nature category. More activities may be organized at the French school to improve the values in this category. Teachers must be able to consider the fact that each individual might have different value preferences and reflect this in education and training process. In program development processes, developing the educational curricula by examining the educational programs of other countries may bring more benefits in terms of value education.

In future studies, the value perceptions of students from different grades at schools of different countries might be investigated. In addition, the elements that affect the value perception of students may be investigated in detail. The value teaching approaches used to teach values at schools of different countries may be determined by using different data collection techniques. The efficiency of values education might be increased by teachers by considering different features of students and reflecting these approaches in education.



## References

- Akbaş, O. (2004). *Türk milli eğitim sisteminin duyuşsal amaçlarının ilköğretim II. kademedeki gerçekteşme derecesinin değerdendirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Ankara.
- Aydın, A. (2005). *Dil-Tarih ve Coğrafya Fakültesi öğrencilerinin değerd hiyerarşileri ile İlahiyat Fakültesi öğrencilerinin değerd hiyerarşilerinin karşılaştırılması* (Unpublished master's thesis). Ankara University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Balođlu Uđurlu, N. (2014). Important values of American and Turkish students. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 55, 91-108. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1060473>
- Begley, P., & Leonard, P. (2005). *The values of educational administration: A book of readings*. London and NewYork: Routledge Falmer.
- Berkes, N. (2010). *Türkiye'de çağdaşlaşma* (15<sup>th</sup> ed.). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Publishing.
- Clarkson, J. (2009). What is comparative education? In W. Bignold & L. Gayton (Eds.), *Global issues and comparative education* (pp. 4-18). Exeter: Learning Matters.
- Çalışkan, H., & Sađlam, H. I. (2012). A study on the development of the tendency to tolerance scale and an analysis of the tendencies of primary school students to tolerance through certain variables. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(2), 1440-1445. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ987854>
- Çalışkan, H., & Karademir, Ç. (2014). Deđer yönelimleri ölçeđinin Türkçe'ye uyarlanması. *Deđerler Eđitimi Dergisi*, 12(28), 47-68. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/302356>
- Çalışkan, H., Sapmaz, F., & Uzunkol, E. (2015). Value preferences of university students as predictors of life goals. *Social Indicators Research*, 124(1), 111-125. Retrieved from <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11205-014-0778-4>
- Çengelci, T. (2010). *İlköğretim beşinci sınıf sosyal bilgiler dersinde değerdler eğitiminin gerçekteştirilmesine ilişkin bir durum çalışması* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, Eskişehir.
- Debats, D. L., & Bartelds, B. F. (1996). The structure of human values: a principal components analysis of the Rokeach Value Survey (RVS) Retrieved from <http://www.dissertations.ub.rug.nl/FILES/faculties/ppsw/1996/dlhmdebats/c5>
- Demirhan İşcan, C. (2007). *İlköğretim düzeyinde değerdler eğitimi programının etkililiđi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Hacettepe University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Dođanay, A. (2006). Deđerler eğitimi. In C. Öztürk (Ed.), *Hayat bilgisi ve sosyal bilgiler öğretimini* (pp. 255-286). Ankara: Pegem-A Publishing.
- Dilmaç, B., Bozgeyikli, H., & Çıkılı, Y. (2008). Öğretmen adaylarının değerd algılarının farklı değerişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Deđerler Eđitimi Dergisi*, 6(16), 69-91. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/302509>
- Ekşi, H., & Katılmış, A. (2016). *Uygulama örnekleriyle değerdler eğitimi*. Ankara: Nobel Publishing.
- Ergün, M. (1990). Türk eğitim sisteminin batılılaşmasını belirleyen dinamikler. *Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Dergisi*, 17, 453-457. Retrieved from <http://mustafaergun.com.tr/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Dinamikler.pdf>
- Evin, İ., & Kafadar, O. (2004). İlköğretim sosyal bilgiler programının ve ders kitaplarının ulusal ve evrensel değerdler yönünden içerik çözümlenmesi. *Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(3), 293-304. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/256416>
- Halstead, J. M. (1996). Values and values education in schools. In J. M. Halstead & M. J. Taylor (Eds.), *Values in education and education in values* (pp. 2-13). London: Routledge Falmer.

- Halstead, J. M. (2006). Why citizenship? why moral education? In M. Halstead & M. A. Pike (Eds.), *Citizenship and moral education: Values in action* (pp. 5-48). New York: Routledge.
- Haydon, G. (2007). *Values for educational leadership*. Sage Publishing.
- Huitt, W. (2004). Moral and character development. *Educational psychology interactive*. Retrieved from <http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/>
- Kafadar, T, Öztürk, C., & Katılmış, A. (2018). Comparison of the social studies curricula of different countries in terms of values education. *Ahi Evran University Journal of Kırşehir Education Faculty*, 19(1), 154-177. Retrieved from <http://kefad.ahievran.edu.tr/InstitutionArchiveFiles/f44778c7-ad4a-e711-80ef-00224d68272d/d1a3a581-af4a-e711-80ef-00224d68272d/Cilt19Sayi1/c76434f1>
- Katılmış, A. (2010). *Sosyal bilgiler derslerindeki bazı değerlerin kazandırılmasına yönelik bir karakter eğitimi programının geliştirilmesi* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, Graduate School of Educational Sciences, İstanbul.
- Kuşdil, M. E., & Kağıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2000). Türk öğretmenlerinin değer yönelimleri ve Schwartz değer kuramı. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 15(45), 59-76. Retrieved from <http://www.turkpsikolojidergisi.com/PDF/TPD/45/04.pdf>
- Lovat, T., Toomey, R., & Clement, N. (2010). *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research. A guide to design and implementation* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage Publications.
- Oğuz, E. (2012). Views of pre-service teachers on values and value education. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 12(2), 1309-1325. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ987847>
- Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25(1), 1-65. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Shalom\\_Schwartz](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Shalom_Schwartz)
- Schwartz, S. H., Melech, G., Lehmann, A., Burgess, S., Harris, M., & Owens, V. (2001). Extending the cross-cultural validity of the theory of basic human values with a different method of measurement. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 32(5), 519-542. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Shalom\\_Schwartz](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Shalom_Schwartz)
- Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., ... Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103, 663-688. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Shalom\\_Schwartz](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Shalom_Schwartz)
- Schwartz, S. H. (2015). Basic individual values: Sources and consequences. In D. Sander & T. Brosch (Eds.), *Handbook of value*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paterson, R. W. K. (2010). *Values, education and the adult*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ülken, H. Z. (2001). *Bilgi ve değer*. İstanbul: Ülken Publishing.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Ankara: Seçkin Publishing.
- Zecha, G. (2007). Opening the road to values education. In D. N. Aspin & J. D. Chapman (Eds.), *Values education and lifelong learning: Principles, policies, programmes* (pp. 48-61). Springer.