

New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences



Volume 4, Issue 6, (2017) 91-97

ISSN 2547-8818 www.prosoc.eu

Selected Paper of 6th International Conference on Education (IC-ED-2017), 29 June 2017 – 01 July 2017, University of Zagreb – Zagreb – Croatia

Values in preschool education

Hilal Karoglu^a*, Education Faculty, Bayburt University, 69000 Bayburt, Turkey Fatma Calisandemir^b, Education Faculty, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, 15030 Burdur, Turkey Perihan Unuvar^c, Education Faculty, Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, 15030 Burdur, Turkey

Suggested Citation:

Karoglu, H., Calisandemir, F. & Unuvar, P. (2017). Values in preschool education. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*. [Online]. 4(6), 91-97. Available from: <u>www.prosoc.eu</u>

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Prof. Dr. Milan Matijevic, University of Zagreb, Croatia [©]2017 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

Abstract

Preschool years have an important place in the formation of moral values and in the socialisation of the individual afterwards. Social values that make up an important part of human life are acquired by children who lead a normal life. This research on the ages of children, having value, gender, parental education status and mother's work status was performed in order to determine whether it differs. The study group consisted of 121 children who received preschool education in Bayburt province centre. In order to obtain information by parents and teachers, the PreSchool Values Scale Family and Parent Form developed by Nesliturk and Celikoz were used. Data were analysed by the SPSS program. As a result of the analysis, children's value scores differed significantly according to their age and gender, while parents' education level and mother's working conditions showed that the results did not differ significantly.

Keywords: Values, preschool, children.

^{*} ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Hilal Karoglu**, Education Faculty, Bayburt University, 69000 Bayburt, Turkey. *E-mail address*: karogluhilal@hotmail.com / Tel.: +90 (458) 211 11 53

1. Introduction

Values are closely related to people's feelings, thoughts and behaviours (Kusdil & Kagitcibasi, 2000). Responsibility, respect, justice, benevolence, honesty and tolerance are generally accepted values. These values shape the behaviour of individuals by determining the frame of attitudes (Demirhan Iscan, 2007). Teachers play an important role in values that are adopted, because teachers' attitudes and beliefs shape their behaviour. The teacher's behaviour reflects on the behaviours of students (Weist, 1998). Children transfer their knowledge in life to their social lives over time. It is important that this information is acceptable to the public. Value is an important feature that separates people from other creatures. Preschool education and educators play an important role in the formation of values (Bills & Husbands, 2005). The place where values are first received is over. The communication, lifestyle, attitudes and behaviours of individuals in the family are influential in the values of the children. In the later stages of the child's life, in addition to the family institution, educational institutions, media, friends groups, the focus of influence also plays an important role in bringing value to the individual in the process (Ozdas, 2013, 31). People learn their values and beliefs from other people around them and reflect these values in their behaviour. While parents are primarily responsible for the moral education of their children, after school, the school emerges as an important institution that teaches social values. Values in the school are realised within the process of educating citizens. In this process, teachers transfer values, consciously or otherwise, to their students (Coombs-Richardson & Tolson, 2005). Children gain various values; factors such as family, school, teacher, social environment, group of friends and media can be effective. The level of development of a society is closely related to the characteristics and values of the individuals who make up that society. Values lead to behaviour and constitute the preferences of individuals (Atabey & Omeroglu, 2016). Children will be guided by their behaviour and preferences when they are adults. It is important that the values based on the behaviours and preferences of children are examined and earned from early ages. Knowing the variables that children can affect the values they possess will shed light on the work to be done in this regard. For this purpose, in this research, it was researched whether the values possessed by preschool children differ according to the age of the children, gender, educational status of their parents and the mother's working status.

2. Method

This is a research in descriptive scanning model. The study group had 57 girls and 64 boys, i.e., 47.1% girls and 52.9% boys. In terms of age, 12.4% of the study group was aged 36–48 months, 30.6% of the study group was aged 49–60 months and 57% of the study group was aged 61–72. 9.1% of the children were single children, 50.4% had one sibling and 40.5% had more than one siblings. 30.6% of the children's mothers were working outside the home while 69.4% housewives. The data of the study were obtained from the PreSchool Values Form developed by Nesliturk and Celikoz (2015) with the Family and Teacher Form and the Personal Information Form created by researchers.

3. Findings

Are the values of children differentiated by their age? To answer this question, the data were analysed and are given in Table 1.

| Family form | Months n | | Rank mean SD | | \overline{x} | p | Significant difference | |
|----------------|----------|----|--------------|----|----------------|-----|---------------------------|--|
| | 36–48 | 15 | 56.37 | | | | | |
| Responsibility | 49–60 | 37 | 61.69 | 2 | .30 | .85 | No difference | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 61.64 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 52.97 | | | | | |
| Respect | 49–60 | 37 | 52.64 | 2 | 5.19 | .07 | No difference | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 67.23 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 59.13 | | | | | |
| Cooperation | 49–60 | 37 | 63.30 | 2 | .25 | .88 | No difference | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 60.17 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 66.97 | | | | | |
| Honesty | 49–60 | 37 | 61.22 | 2 | .57 | .75 | No difference | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 59.59 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 51.17 | | | | | |
| Friendship | 49–60 | 37 | 62.64 | 2 | 1.82 | .40 | No difference | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 62.26 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 32.87 | | | | 2 > 1 | |
| Sharing | 49–60 | 37 | 53.73 | 2 | 17.82 | .00 | 3 > 1 | |
| - | 61–76 | 69 | 71.01 | | | | 3 > 2 | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 49.63 | | | | | |
| Total | 49–60 | 37 | 55.99 | 2 | 3.84 | .14 | No difference | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 66.16 | | | | | |
| Teacher form | Months | n | Rank mean | SD | \overline{x} | р | Significant difference | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 38.53 | | | | | |
| Responsibility | 49–60 | 37 | 58.50 | 2 | 9.37 | .00 | 3 > 1 | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 67.22 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 35.50 | | | | 3 > 1 | |
| Respect | 49–60 | 37 | 58.58 | 2 | 11.23 | .00 | 2 > 1 | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 67.84 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 36.87 | | | | 3 > 1 | |
| Cooperation | 49–60 | 37 | 52.14 | 2 | 15.92 | .00 | 3 > 2 | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 71.00 | | | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 47.00 | | | | 3 > 1 | |
| Honesty | 49–60 | 37 | 52.84 | 2 | 7.69 | .02 | 3 > 2 | |
| nonesty | 61–76 | 69 | 68.42 | | | - | - | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 34.93 | | | | 3 > 1 | |
| Friendship | 49–60 | 37 | 65.24 | 2 | 10.98 | .00 | 2 > 1 | |
| menusinp | 61–76 | 69 | 64.39 | - | 20100 | | | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 33.73 | | | | 3 > 1 | |
| Sharing | 49–60 | 37 | 57.12 | 2 | 15.61 | .00 | 2 > 1 | |
| | 61–76 | 69 | 69.01 | - | 10.01 | .00 | 27 1 | |
| | 36–48 | 15 | 31.17 | | | | 3 > 1 | |
| | 30 -10 | | | | | | | |
| Total | 49–60 | 37 | 57.36 | 2 | 15.29 | .00 | 2 > 1 | |

> Table 1. The year line of the evolution of the upluse of shildren and

36–48: 1 49–60: 2 61–76: 3 *p* < 0.05

The total and total value scores of teachers' children's scores were significantly different according to age (p < 0.05); According to the data obtained from the family form, only the sharing scores differ

significantly. This significant difference is shown in Table 1, where children with older age change favourably.

Are the values of children differentiated by gender? To answer this question, the data were analysed and presented in Table 2.

| Family form | Gender | п | \overline{x} | S | SD | t | р |
|----------------|--------|----|----------------|------|-----|------|-----|
| Responsibility | Male | 64 | 5.21 | 2.13 | 110 | 3.65 | 00 |
| | Female | 57 | 6.61 | 2.05 | 119 | | .00 |
| Decreat | Male | 64 | 6.95 | 1.78 | 110 | 22 | 01 |
| Respect | Female | 57 | 7.03 | 2.23 | 119 | .22 | .82 |
| Cooperation | Male | 64 | 8.07 | 1.21 | 119 | .20 | .84 |
| Cooperation | Female | 57 | 8.12 | 1.21 | 119 | | .84 |
| Honosty | Male | 64 | 8.00 | 1.72 | 119 | 1.06 | 20 |
| Honesty | Female | 57 | 8.31 | 1.50 | 119 | 1.00 | .28 |
| Friendship | Male | 64 | 9.37 | 1.03 | 119 | .15 | .87 |
| rnenusnip | Female | 57 | 9.40 | 1.01 | 119 | .15 | .87 |
| Sharing | Male | 64 | 8.07 | 1.74 | 110 | 2 01 | .04 |
| Sharing | Female | 57 | 8.66 | 1.45 | 119 | 2.01 | |
| Total | Male | 64 | 45.70 | 5.89 | 119 | 2.28 | .02 |
| TOLAI | Female | 57 | 48.15 | 5.90 | 119 | | .02 |
| Teacher form | Gender | п | \overline{x} | S | SD | t | р |
| Responsibility | Male | 64 | 7.76 | 2.40 | 119 | 2.61 | .01 |
| Responsibility | Female | 57 | 8.82 | 2.04 | 119 | | |
| Respect | Male | 64 | 7.91 | 3.90 | 119 | .96 | .33 |
| Respect | Female | 57 | 8.45 | 1.96 | 115 | | |
| Cooperation | Male | 64 | 7.90 | 1.94 | 119 | 1.23 | .21 |
| cooperation | Female | 57 | 8.33 | 1.85 | 115 | | |
| Honesty | Male | 64 | 6.82 | 1.70 | 119 | 1.31 | .19 |
| nonesty | Female | 57 | 7.26 | 1.91 | 115 | 1.51 | |
| Friendship | Male | 64 | 8.76 | 1.53 | 119 | 1.72 | .08 |
| riciusiip | Female | 57 | 9.21 | 1.30 | 117 | 1.72 | .08 |
| Sharing | Male | 64 | 8.35 | 1.90 | 119 | 2.67 | .00 |
| Sharing | Female | 57 | 9.15 | 1.36 | 113 | 2.07 | .00 |
| Total | Male | 64 | 47.54 | 9.35 | 119 | 2.33 | .02 |
| iotai | Female | 57 | 51.24 | 8.08 | 115 | 2.33 | |

The difference in the total value scores of the children from the teachers and the families was found to be different according to gender (p < 0.05). When we look at the scores obtained from the family, the responsibility, sharing and total value points differed; Respect, cooperation, honesty, friendship scores did not differ (p > 0.05). When the scores obtained from the teachers were examined, it was found that responsibility, sharing and total scores differed, respect, cooperation, honesty and friendship values did not differ.

Are the values of children differentiated based on the educational status of the parents? To answer this question, the data were analysed and are given in Table 3.

| mother's educational status | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|----|--------------|----|----------------|-----|---------------------------|--|
| Values | Father education status | n | Rank mean | SD | \overline{x} | р | Significant difference | |
| | Primary school | 12 | 52.13 | | | | | |
| Family form | Middle school | 8 | 59.88 | | | | No difference | |
| | High school | 39 | 58.05 | 4 | 1.93 | .74 | No unerence | |
| | License | 55 | 64.05 | | | | | |
| | Graduate | 7 | 69.93 | | | | | |
| | Primary school | 12 | 69.25 | | | | | |
| Teacher | Middle school | 8 | 59.06 | | | | | |
| form | High school | 39 | 58.36 | 4 | 1.08 | .89 | No difference | |
| | License | 55 | 61.96 | | | | | |
| | Graduate | 7 | 56.21 | | | | | |
| Values | Mother education | п | Rank mean | SD | \overline{x} | p | Significant | |
| values | status | п | | | | | difference | |
| Family form | Primary school | 35 | 50.93 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 12 | 47.88 | | | | | |
| | High school | 28 | 67.39 | 4 | 7.67 | .10 | No difference | |
| | License | 43 | 67.58 | | | | | |
| | Graduate | 3 | 77.00 | | | | | |
| Teacher | Primary school | 35 | 57.23 | | | | | |
| | Middle school | 12 | 61.42 | | | | | |
| form | High school | 28 | 63.23 | 4 | .62 | .96 | No difference | |
| IOIIII | License | 43 | 62.19 | | | | | |
| | Graduate | 3 | 65.50 | | | | | |

Table 3. The results of the analysis of the values of children according to their father's and mother's educational status

Findings showed that the value scores obtained from family and teacher forms did not differ significantly according to the educational status of the mothers and fathers (p > 0.05).

Are the values of children differentiated according to the working status of their mother? To answer this question, the data were analysed and are given in Table 4.

| Values | Source of variance | Sum of square | SD | Mean square | F | p | Significant difference |
|-----------------|--------------------|---------------|-----|----------------|-----|-----|------------------------|
| Family form | Between groups | 17.49 | 1 | 17.49 | | | |
| | Within groups | 4305.11 | 119 | 36.17 | .48 | .48 | No difference |
| | Total | 4322.61 | 120 | | | | |
| Teacher form | Between groups | 16.68 | 1 | 16.68 | | | |
| | Within groups | 9572.19 | 119 | 80.43 | .20 | .65 | No difference |
| | Total | 9588.87 | 120 | | | | |

Findings that the value scores obtained from family and teacher forms did not differ significantly according to the working status of the mothers were obtained (p > 0.05).

4. Discussion, conclusions and suggestions

According to research findings, the value points obtained from the family and teacher forms differed significantly in relation to the age of the children. The results of Dilmac (1999) researches conducted for fourth and fifth grade students are as follows: Nesliturk and Celikoz (2015) conducted a

group of 5- to 6-year olds according to the results of the programme's application. As a result, the children's value scores did not significantly differ according to age. Aktepe and Yalcinkaya (2016) reached the result that the students' scores from the third to the seventh grade in their studies was conducted by taking the opinions of the students differed significantly according to age.

According to research findings, it was found that the value points obtained from the family and teacher forms were significantly different from the genders of the children. The results of Aktepe and Yalcinkaya (2016) students were found to be in favour of the girls. The results of Aktas (2010) showed that the fifth-grade students showed meaningful differences in the level of appreciation according to the gender variable. Caliskan and Saglam (2012) reached the conclusion that girls more positively approach value education than boys. Nesliturk and Celikoz (2015) reached the conclusion that the value scores prepared for the fourth and fifth grade students of Dilmac (1999) did not significantly differ according to the genders of the children, as a result of the research conducted by the 5–6-year old group.

According to research findings, it was found that the value scores obtained from the family and teacher forms did not differ significantly according to the educational status of the parents. Aktas (2010) achieved a significant difference in the level of appreciation according to the educational status of the parents. Turk's (2009) study about the level of education of the families reached the conclusion that the child could influence the education of values. Aktepe and Yalcinkaya (2016) reached the conclusion that the values did not differ according to the educational status of the parents. Caliskan and Saglam (2012) reached the conclusion that tolerance in children differs according to the education level of the father.

According to research findings, it was found that the value scores obtained from family and teacher forms did not differ significantly according to the working status of the mothers. Aktepe and Yalcinkaya (2016), in their studies on value education in the school environment, found that children with mothers who did not work had more positive values than mothers who worked. As a result of the research, it can be suggested to examine the effect of different variables on the values.

References

- Aktas, N. (2010). Levels of fifth grade students in primary school to acquire the values given in the social studies program (Erzincan example) (Graduate Thesis). Primary Education Department, Institute of Social Sciences, Ataturk University, Erzurum.
- Aktepe, V. & Yalcinkaya, E. (2016). Investigation of values education in school environment in terms of various variables according to student opinions. *Journal of Ahi Evran University Kirsehir Education Faculty*, 17(2), 113–131.
- Atabey, D. & Omeroglu, E. (2016). Development of the scale of preschool social values acquisition, *Balikesir* University Institute of Social Sciences Journal, 19(35), 101–136.
- Caliskan, H. & Saglam, H. I. (2012). The development of the tendency towards tolerance and the examination of the tendency of tolerance of primary school students in terms of various variables. *Theory and Practice in Educational Sciences*, 1431–1446.
- Coombs-Richardson, R. & Tolson H. (2005). A comparison of values rankings for selected American and Australian teachers. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *4*, 263–277.
- Demirhan Iscan, C. (2007). *The effectiveness of the education program at the level of primary education* (Doctoral thesis). Social Sciences Institute, Hacettepe University.
- Dilmac, B. (1999). Education of human values to primary school students and examination of education with moral maturity scale (Graduate thesis). Institute of Educational Sciences, Marmara University, Istanbul.
- Kusdil, M. E. & Kagitcibasi, C. (2000). Values orientation of Turkish teachers and schwartz value theory. *Journal of Turkish Psychology*, 15(45), 59–76.
- Nesliturk, S. & Celikoz, N. (2015). Validity and reability for preschool value scale-parent and teacher form. *Dicle University Ziya Gokalp Education Faculty Journal,* 24, 19–42.

- Ozdas, F. (2013). *Evaluation of values in secondary schools and teacher opinions on undesired student behaviours* (Doctoral thesis). Educational Sciences Institute, Firat University, Elazig.
- Turk, I. (2009). *Respect in values education* (Graduate thesis). Institute of Social Sciences, Gaziosmanpaşa University.
- Weist, L. R. (1998). Using immersion to shake up pre-service teachers' views about cultural differences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49(5), 358–365.