



Investigation of values teaching responsibility perceptions of prospective teachers

Filiz Çetin ^{a *}, Şaban Çetin ^b, A. Selcen Bingöl ^c

^{a,b,c} Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Campus, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

Values teaching is among the education topics that have been discussed extensively in both international and national education platforms recently and it is known that well-trained teachers are an important predictor of success in value teaching. The study aimed to scrutinize prospective teachers' perceptions of values teaching responsibility. In the study, the Survey method was adopted. The data were collected via "Value Teaching Responsibility Perception Scale" developed by Çetin et al. (2019). The scale was administered to a total of 455 prospective teachers, 326 of whom were female and 129 were male at Gazi University Gazi Faculty of Education in different departments and different grade levels in the autumn semester of 2018-2019 academic year. The collected data were analyzed through the SPSS package program, and t-Test and One-Way Variance Analysis (ANOVA) techniques among parametric tests were used since the distribution showed normality characteristics. In order to determine the effect of independent variables on prospective teachers' perceptions, effect size values were calculated. The results revealed that the perceptions of prospective teachers' values teaching responsibility perceptions differed according to the participants' gender, their grade level, academic achievement status, minding values teaching variables, and the variables had a different degree of size effect on the values teaching responsibility perception scores, however, according to the scores obtained from the overall scale, no difference was observed in terms of place of residence with the family variable.

Keywords: Responsibility perception; values teaching; teacher training; prospective teachers

© 2016 IJCI & the Authors. Published by *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction (IJCI)*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC BY-NC-ND) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The concepts of values and worthlessness frequently come to the fore when trying to make sense of or resolve many events that are experienced in the world that are human-based and also harm humanity. Depreciation is shown as an address for many similar

* Corresponding author: Filiz Çetin
E-mail address: ficetin@gazi.edu.tr

events. This situation causes the societies to question the value systems they have frequently and intensely.

Values are integrative phenomena embraced by society and individuals, as they meet social needs of society and carry consolidative power. At the same time, this phenomenon guides individuals' thoughts and behaviors (Çavdar, 2009).

Values are understandings that insights that cause behavior and judge them. Values also identify what individuals consider important, showing desires, preferences, and desired and undesirable situations. Values are the only elements that guide people's lives. If a person does not value something; knowing it, understanding its importance and understanding it does not mean that it will be transformed into behavior. In addition, the values include limits among themselves according to the meaning they carry (Dilmaç, 2007; Tahiroğlu ve Aktepe, 2015).

Family, school and society are the most important factors that affect formation of values. However, today it is observed that this phenomenon shows a rapid trend of change through written and visual media. Information and communication technologies, which have a great place in human life, also bring together disadvantages in terms of value, such as the alienation of individuals to the values of the society they live in. Different problems experienced in the social structure, where globalization and its negative effects are intense, people acting individually, focusing on interests, and most importantly, increasing violent incidents necessitated taking values education into account more seriously for all societies (Arabacı & Akgül, 2013; Merter ve Şekerci, 2015).

The fact that the human being, who is a social entity, trying to be completely technological, trying to hold on only to existing history, perceiving education simply by seeing it as only the vaccination of ideas, causes a serious confusion in values. It should be known that it is not possible for an education system to perform its duties completely free of values (Dilmaç, 1999).

As it is known, the existing values are tried to be transferred to the next generations through education. It is thought that the value education programs implemented in schools have an important role in doing this effectively and by this way solutions to the value-oriented problems faced by the rapidly changing world would be contributed. The main function of values education is to provide individual and social peace. In this way, societies can live in peace, societies living in peace develop and take their place in developed societies. Because values education not only improves people but also improves institutions (Bottery, 2004; Yaşar, Kasa ve Bayır, 2015).

It is through education that the individual is aware of certain values or gains awareness about values, generates new values in this context, adopts and shapes her/his personality accordingly and reflects this phenomenon in her/his behavior. This education

is called “values education” in the literature which is described as an open and conscious initiative in teaching values (Keskin, 2008; Yeşil & Aydın, 2007).

Value education means the teaching of social, political, cultural and aesthetic values owned by the society. Schools play an important role in the value education process, while teachers act as one of the main actors in this process (Coombs-Richardson & Tolson, 2005(Veugelers & Vedder, 2003).).

S/he who is the primarily responsible for teaching work is the teacher. Most of the success and failure in the teaching process is related with how teachers use their roles and responsibilities. It is stated that teachers' perceptions of responsibility are an important but not a sufficient enough if alone variable in transforming goal-achievements determined in the curriculum into a qualified manner in students. In addition, it is emphasized that our behavior for responsibility means a choice and the existence of a choice brings responsibility with it (Aremu, 2000; Asikhia, 2010, Cengil, 2015).

Bovens (cited in 1998: 165. Şahan, 2011: 11) proposed a conceptual five classifications to explain responsibility. Responsibility according to this classification is listed as “hierarchical, personal, social, professional and citizenship responsibility.” In this classification, the person, object or institution to which responsibility is directed also changes.

When prospective teachers are being talked about, specialist responsibility and academic responsibility are on the agenda, as both a professional group is trained and academic competence in this direction is in question. Considering that value teaching is mainly carried out through hidden curricula and how to teach values in this direction are not included in the teacher training programs adequately, it is necessary to determine the responsibility perceptions of teachers and prospective teachers for their success in value teaching (Pantic & Wubbels, 2012). Because the teacher's responsibility perception has been found to be related to many factors related to teaching.

In this context, in terms of teachers' perceptions of responsibility, student motivation (value, desire and interest in the subject), student success (learning, performance and development), relations with students (trust in the teacher, asking for help in difficult situations and knowing that the teacher is interested in students) and teaching quality (teaching effective and conspicuous) are the four dimensions defined (Berger ve Girardet, 2020, Halvorsen, Lee & Andrade, 2009; Winter, Brenner & Petrosko, 2006).

Teachers 'perceptions of personal responsibility have the potential to affect their teaching practices, their psychological well-being and, consequently, their students' learning situations and performances (Lauermaann, 2013).

Faculties of Education are the first places where prospective teachers encounter the process of gaining responsibility in terms of teaching. The perception of responsibility

developed by prospective teachers about their profession and therefore their education plays an important role in their ability to adapt to the profession group they belong to, to be accepted as a valuable profession by their environment and to gain prestige. In this direction, developing the awareness of responsibility towards value education, which is of great importance in maintaining the existence of the society, should be among the primary objectives of the Faculties of Education.

In the literature, no studies on determining the values teaching responsibility perceptions of prospective teachers, therefore it is thought that the study is important in terms of contributing to a wealth of literature in this direction. The aim of this research is to examine prospective teachers' perceptions of value teaching responsibility in the context of different variables.

In accordance with this aim, answers to the following questions were sought;

1. How is the distribution of scores of prospective teachers they received from the values teaching responsibility perception scale?
2. Do the values teaching responsibility perception scores of prospective teachers show a meaningful difference according to gender, the grade level, academic achievement, caring about value teaching, and family and the place lived in variables?

2. Method

2.1. The Research Model

This research is a descriptive study in survey model. Survey model aims to describe a situation that exists in the past or still as it exists (Çokluk et al., 2010; Karasar, 2000). With this research, it was tried to determine the prospective teachers' perceptions of responsibility regarding value teaching. With the research, it was tried to determine the responsibility perceptions of teacher candidates for value teaching by considering different independent variables. In cases where a statistically significant difference was detected in the findings of the variables, the effect size values for the variable values were also calculated in order to make the description even more meaningful.

2.2. The Study Group

The study group of the study consisted of 6453 prospective teachers studying in different grades and departments of Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education in the Autumn semester of 2018-2019 academic year. As for the difficulty of reaching the whole population, sample was taken by choosing 4 out of all departments were randomly chosen and systematic random method was used for determining the prospective teachers

studying in the chosen departments and the scale was implemented to 455 prospective teachers.

When the demographic characteristics of the group of prospective teachers to which the measurement tool is applied are examined, it is seen that 326 (71.6%) of the prospective teachers participating in the research are female and 129 (28.4%) are male. 182 (30.0%) of prospective teacher's study in the first grade (freshman), 113 (24.8%) in the 2nd grade (sophomore), 72 (15.8%) in the 3rd grade (sophister), and 88 (19.3%) in the 4th grade (final year). The academic success level of 188 (41.3%) prospective teachers is "very good", 191 (42%) are "good" and 76 (16.7%) are at medium level. Of the prospective teachers, 211 (46.4%) report that they "care very much" about value teaching, 194 (42.6%) "care" and 50 (11.0%) "partially care". 115 pre-service teachers (25.3%) stated that they lived with their families in the district, 76 (16.7%) in the village and 264 (58.0%) in the city.

2.3. Data Collection and Analysis

Data in the study were collected via the "Value teaching responsibility perception scale" developed by Çetin et al. Which consisted 35 items and four sub-factors as "Individual Effort in Value Teaching", "Disseminating and Supporting Value Teaching", "Sustaining Value Teaching" and "Openness to Development in Value Teaching".

As a result of Explanatory Factor Analysis and reliability analysis; Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was determined as .96 and Barlett Spehericity value as a result of the Barlett test was determined as [$X^2 = 6639,109$; $p < .001$]. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient values related to the scale and its sub-dimensions range from .84 and .97

Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for the scale general is .97. In addition, the t-test results between the scores of high-low 27% groups differ at the level of significance of $P < .001$. The Spearman-Brown internal consistency coefficient calculated for two equal halves of the scale has a very high "0.92" value. Correlation values for the scale general and each sub-factor are between 0.56 and 0.93, with a moderate and high positive relationship at the level of $\alpha = 0.01$ significance. Conformity values obtained as a result of confirmatory factor analysis; are in the acceptable value ranges as; RMSEA, .066; $\chi^2/df = 2.4$; SRMR=.05; IFI=.90; CFI=.90

The highest score that can be obtained from the scale where there is no negative item is 175 whereas the lowest score is 35. The high score to be taken from the scale indicates that value teaching responsibility perception is high, and the low score indicates that value teaching responsibility perception is low.

The data obtained from the implementation of the measurement tool were transferred to the SPSS package program and analyzes were performed on the data set. Before the analysis, whether the data set met the parametric test conditions was firstly tested, and for this, central tendency measures such as mode, median and arithmetic mean for

distribution were checked. Moreover, the skewness coefficients were examined and it was observed that these values were at acceptable levels within the borders of +1 and -1 in all variables and the scatter plots reflected the normal distribution.

As a result, t test and variance analysis techniques were used for groups independent of parametric tests according to their variable structure. Scheffe test results were used when the variances were homogeneous and Dunet C test results were used when they were not. The effect size values for the variables, where significant differences were detected in the test results, were calculated.

3. Results

The distribution of the total attitude scores the prospective teachers obtained from the scale are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Table title (this is an example of a table)

	N	\bar{X}	ss	Min.	Max.	Item Number	Score Interval
I. Sub-Dimension	455	57.95	9.09	24	70	14	\bar{X} 59.61 – 90.00 f % 216 47.47
II. Sub-Dimension	455	35.62	6.67	9	45	9	\bar{X} 30.61 – 45,00 f % 367 80.66
III. Sub-Dimension	455	31.69	6.07	9	40	8	\bar{X} 27.21 – 40.00 f % 362 79.56
IV. Sub-Dimension	455	13.45	3.30	4	20	4	\bar{X} 13.61 – 20.00 f % 232 50.99
Scale General	455	138.71	22.66	46	175	35	\bar{X} 119.01 – 175.00 f % 375 82.42

Table 1 gives information about the distribution of the scores of the prospective teachers who participated in the study from the overall and sub-dimensions of the value teaching responsibility perception scale. The range of points for the scale and its sub-dimensions in the table reflects positive perception. When the table is examined, it is observed that the perception score averages of teacher candidates are =138.71. When the

average of the score is examined considering the total score scale to be taken from the scale, it was determined that prospective teachers have a high perception regarding the sense of responsibility in value teaching and 82% of them are at a perception in this level. This finding can be interpreted as the majority of prospective teachers' perceptions of value teaching responsibility are at a "high level".

When the perception scores of the prospective teachers in terms of the scale sub-dimensions are evaluated, they have a high responsibility perception in the first sub-dimension (Individual Effort in Value Teaching) at 47.47% and in the 4th sub-dimension (Openness to Improvement in Value Teaching) 50.99%. This finding shows that the rates of those who have a high sense of responsibility represent half of the teachers participating in the study, while the other half have an unstable and low level of sense of responsibility in terms of value teaching responsibility perception.

It is observed that the scores of responsibility perception in the other two factors in the scale reflect the high responsibility perception of the 2nd Factor (disseminating and supporting the value teaching) 80.66% and the third factor (sustaining value teaching) 79.56%, and the scale is similar to the general distribution score.

The distribution of perception scores of prospective teachers from the scale according to the gender variable is given in table 2.

Table 2. T test results of prospective teachers according to gender variable

Sub-Dimensions of the Scale	Gender	n	\bar{X}	ss	t	p	Cohens' d																																												
I. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	58,69	7,92	2,40	,017*	0,29																																												
	Male	129	56,07	11,37				II. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	36,55	5,61	4,12	,000*	0,51	Male	129	33,26	8,37	III. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	32,21	5,06	2,47	,015*	0,31	Male	129	30,36	7,95	IV. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	13,42	2,86	,284	,776	-	Male	129	13,53	4,21	Scale Total	Female	326	140,88	18,73	2,77	,007	0,34
II. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	36,55	5,61	4,12	,000*	0,51																																												
	Male	129	33,26	8,37				III. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	32,21	5,06	2,47	,015*	0,31	Male	129	30,36	7,95	IV. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	13,42	2,86	,284	,776	-	Male	129	13,53	4,21	Scale Total	Female	326	140,88	18,73	2,77	,007	0,34	Male	129	133,22	29,80								
III. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	32,21	5,06	2,47	,015*	0,31																																												
	Male	129	30,36	7,95				IV. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	13,42	2,86	,284	,776	-	Male	129	13,53	4,21	Scale Total	Female	326	140,88	18,73	2,77	,007	0,34	Male	129	133,22	29,80																				
IV. Sub-Dimension	Female	326	13,42	2,86	,284	,776	-																																												
	Male	129	13,53	4,21				Scale Total	Female	326	140,88	18,73	2,77	,007	0,34	Male	129	133,22	29,80																																
Scale Total	Female	326	140,88	18,73	2,77	,007	0,34																																												
	Male	129	133,22	29,80																																															

* p<0.05

When Table 2 is analyzed, it is observed that female prospective teachers' value teaching responsibility perception total score averages is =140,88 and male prospective teachers' score averages =133,22 and there is a meaningful difference between the mean

scores [$t(453) = 2,77, p < 0.05$]. According to the findings of this research, it can be said that the perceptions of female prospective teachers' candidates value teaching responsibility are higher than that of male prospective teachers and this distribution is similar to the overall score distribution from the four sub-dimensions of the scale, except for the fourth sub-dimension, and there is a significant difference in favor of the female prospective teachers in all three sub-dimensions.

In addition, the effect size values were calculated in order to determine the effect of the gender variable on the scale and its sub-dimensions. Impact size in sub-dimensions and scale-general range respectively for 1st Sub-dimension Cohens'd = 0.29 "low", 2nd Sub-dimension Cohens'd = 0.51 "medium", 3rd Sub-dimension Cohens'd = 0.31 "Low" and Cohens'd = 0.34 "low" for the scale in general.

The distribution of the perception scores the prospective teachers obtained from the scale according to the grade attended is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Variance Analysis Results of Prospective Teachers' Perception Scores According the Grade Attended

Sub-Dimensions of the Scale	The grade attended	n	\bar{X}	ss	F	p	Intergroup Difference	Size Effect (η^2)
I. Sub-Dimension	Freshman	182	54,59	10,68	8,309	,000*	1-2,1-3,1-4	,052
	Sophomore	113	58,44	7,87				
	Sophister	72	58,68	9,23				
	Final	88	60,78	5,30				
II. Sub-Dimension	Freshman	182	33,58	7,63	10,702	,000*	1-4,2-4,3-4	,066
	Sophomore	113	35,28	6,44				
	Sophister	72	36,16	6,81				
	Final	88	39,00	3,32				
III. Sub-Dimension	Freshman	182	29,06	7,25	14,287	,000*	1-2,1-3,1-4 2-3,2-4,3-4	,087
	Sophomore	113	31,73	5,90				
	Sophister	72	32,12	5,50				
	Final	88	34,67	3,52				
IV. Sub-Dimension	Freshman	182	12,81	3,21	4,193	,006*	1-4,2-4	,027
	Sophomore	113	13,42	3,24				
	Sophister	72	13,43	4,02				
	Final	88	14,56	2,18				
Scale Total	Freshman	182	130,04	26,92	11,315	,000*	1-2,1-3,1-4 2-3,2-4,3-4	,070
	Sophomore	113	139,50	21,30				
	Sophister	72	139,76	22,19				
	Final	88	149,00	12,27				

* $p < 0.05$

When Table 3 is examined, it is seen that the perception scores of prospective teachers differ [$F(3-451) = 11,315, p < 0.05$] according to the grade attended. According to the results of the Scheffe test conducted to determine between which groups the difference occurred, it has been determined that the prospective teachers who study in the fourth

grade (final year) (=149,00) have higher sense of responsibility than those who study in the third (sophister) (=139,76) and second (sophomore) grades (=139,50) and those who study in the first grade (freshman) (=130,04) and those who study in the third grade than the first and second grade moreover those who study in the second grade have higher values teaching responsibility perception.

When the perception scores for the sub-dimensions of the scale were evaluated, a similar distribution of scores was observed, and as the grade level increased, the perception of responsibility differed in favor of the upper grades.

The effect size values were calculated to determine the effect of the grade attended variable on the scale and its sub-dimensions.

Effect size in sub-dimensions and scale-wide array were distributed respectively as; 1st Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,052$ “low”, 2nd Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,066$ “medium”, 3rd Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,087$ “medium”, 4th Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,027$ “low”, and $\eta^2 = ,070$ “medium” for the scale general.

The distribution of perception scores of prospective teachers according to academic success is given in table 4.

Table 4. Variance Analysis Results of Prospective Teachers’ Perception Scores According to Academic Success Level

Sub-Dimensions of the Scale	Academic achievement	n	\bar{X}	ss	F	p	Intergroup Difference	Size Effect (η^2)
I. Sub-Dimension	Medium	76	56,64	9,60	3,136	,044*	1-3	,014
	Good	191	57,25	10,44				
	Very good	188	59,19	7,09				
II. Sub-Dimension	Medium	76	33,58	6,45	9,360	,000*	1-2,1-3,2-3	,040
	Good	191	34,97	7,82				
	Very good	188	37,09	4,99				
III. Sub-Dimension	Medium	76	30,74	7,14	6,366	,002*	1-2,1-3	,027
	Good	191	31,14	5,84				
	Very good	188	32,87	4,65				
IV. Sub-Dimension	Medium	76	13,12	3,71	1,786	,169	-	-
	Good	191	13,59	3,20				
	Very good	188	13,74	2,84				
Scale Total	Medium	76	134,96	22,41	5,650	,004*	1-2,1-3	,024
	Good	191	136,07	26,74				
	Very good	188	142,89	16,98				

* p<0.05

When Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the perception scores of prospective teachers differ according to their academic achievement [F(2-452)= 5,650, p<0.05]. According to the results of the Scheffe test conducted to determine which groups the difference is among, prospective teachers whose academic success level is “very good” (=142,89), have

a higher level of value teaching responsibility perception compared to the prospective teachers whose academic success level is “good” ($=136,07$) and “medium” ($=134,96$). When the perception scores for the sub-dimensions of the scale were evaluated, it was observed that a similar score distribution was observed except for the 4th sub-dimension, and as the success rate increased, the perception of responsibility differed in favor of those with high academic success. In order to determine the effect of academic achievement on scale general and sub-dimensions, effect size values were calculated. Impact size in the sub-dimensions and scale-wide array shows a distribution respectively 1st Sub-dimension $\eta^2 =,014$ "low", 2nd Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,040$ "low", 3rd Sub-dimension $\eta^2 =,027$ "low" and for the scale general $\eta^2 =,024$ “low” distribution.

The distribution of perception scores of prospective teachers according to minding value teaching is given in Table 5.

Table 5. Variance Analysis Results of Prospective Teachers' Perception Scores According to Minding Value Teaching

Sub-Dimensions of the Scale	Minding Value Teaching	n	\bar{X}	ss	F	p	Intergroup Difference	Size Effect (η^2)
I. Sub-Dimension	Partly	50	50,60	13,96	39,113	,000*	1-2,1-3,2-3	,148
	Much	194	56,26	7,81				
	Very Much	211	61,24	7,14				
II. Sub-Dimension	Partly	50	27,40	8,77	90,047	,000*	1-2,1-3,2-3	,285
	Much	194	34,34	5,47				
	Very Much	211	38,74	4,83				
III. Sub-Dimension	Partly	50	24,10	8,30	80,782	,000*	1-2,1-3,2-3	,263
	Much	194	30,85	4,63				
	Very Much	211	34,26	4,78				
IV. Sub-Dimension	Partly	50	11,20	5,17	27,286	,000*	1-2,1-3,2-3	,108
	Much	194	12,92	2,51				
	Very Much	211	14,48	2,99				
Scale Total	Partly	50	113,30	33,01	73,245	,000*	1-2,1-3,2-3	,245
	Much	194	134,37	17,68				
	Very Much	211	148,72	17,23				

* $p < 0.05$

When Table 5 is analyzed, it is seen that the perception scores of prospective teachers differ according to minding value teaching [$F(2-452) = 73,245$, $p < 0.05$].

According to the results of the Scheffe test conducted to determine among which groups the difference is, prospective teachers who mind value teaching "ver much" (

=148,72) have a higher level of value teaching responsibility perception than those who care “much” (=134,37) and “partly” (=113,30) and those who care “much” have a higher level of value teaching responsibility perception than those who care partly.

When the perception scores for the sub-dimensions of the scale were evaluated, it was observed that a similar score distribution was seen and there was a differentiation in favor of those who cared about the value teaching relatively more.

Effect size values were calculated in order to determine the effect of minding value teaching on the scale and its sub-dimensions. Effect size in sub-dimensions and scale-wide array show a distribution respectively such as for; 1st Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,148$ “high”, 2nd Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,285$ “high”, 3rd Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,263$ “high”, and 4th Sub-dimension $\eta^2 = ,108$ “medium” and $\eta^2 = ,245$ “high” distribution for the scale general.

The distribution of perception scores of prospective teachers according to the place of residence with the family is given in table 6.

Table 6. Variance Analysis Results of Prospective Teachers’ Perception Scores According to Place of Residence with the Family

Sub-Dimensions of the Scale	Place of residence with the family	n	\bar{X}	ss	F	p	Intergroup Difference	Size Effect (η^2)
I. Sub-Dimension	1.Village	76	59,22	7,39	1,102	,333	-	-
	2.District	115	58,15	7,64				
	3.City	264	57,50	10,06				
II. Sub-Dimension	1.Village	76	36,91	5,38	1,995	,137	-	-
	2.District	115	35,74	5,14				
	3.City	264	35,19	7,51				
III. Sub-Dimension	1.Village	76	32,93	4,49	5,226	,006*	1-2,1-3	,023
	2.District	115	32,63	5,00				
	3.City	264	30,92	6,75				
IV. Sub-Dimension	1.Village	76	14,03	3,04	2,571	,078	-	-
	2.District	115	13,73	2,30				
	3.City	264	13,17	3,69				
Scale Total	1.Village	76	143,09	17,80	2,571	,070	-	-
	2.District	115	140,25	16,93				
	3.City	264	136,77	25,72				

* p<0.05

When Table 6 is examined, it is seen that the perception scores of prospective teachers do not differentiate according to the place of residence with the family variable [F(2-

452)= 2,571, $p>0.05$]. When the perception scores for the sub-dimensions of the scale are evaluated, it is observed that there is no difference except the 3rd sub-factor, where a similar score distribution is observed. According to the results of the Dunet C test conducted to determine between which groups the third sub-factor [$F(2-452)= 5,226$, $p<0.05$] differed, it was seen that prospective teachers living in the village ($=32,93$), have a higher perception of value teaching responsibility compared to prospective teachers living in the district ($=32,63$) and the city ($=30,92$). However, it is observed that the effect size value calculated for this variable is at a “low” level $\eta^2 =,023$.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

In this study, values teaching responsibility perceptions of prospective teachers was scrutinized. It was determined that 82% of the teacher candidates who participated in the study had high value teaching responsibility perception scores, in other words, they had a high level of sense of responsibility in this direction. When the research findings are examined in the context of variables; it was determined that the gender variable significantly differentiated the mean scores in favor of the female teacher candidates with an effect of Cohens'd = 0,34 “low” in the value teaching responsibility perception scores of teacher candidates. It was observed that the grade level attended differentiated the perception scores of prospective teachers in favor of prospective teachers studying in upper classes with a “medium” level of $\eta^2 =,070$. It was seen that the academic achievement variable differentiated the achievement level in favor of the “very good” and “good” with a “low” level of $\eta^2 =,024$ in teacher candidates' value teaching responsibility perception scores. It was determined that minding value teaching differentiates the perception scores of prospective teachers with the effect of $\eta^2 =,245$ “high” in favor of those who care about “much” and “very much”.

In addition, it was determined that the place of residence with the family variable differentiated the perception scores of the prospective teachers only in favor of the residents of the village in the 3rd sub-dimension, at “low” level $\eta^2 =,023$ and did not make a significant difference in the scale and other sub-dimensions.

Education is a serious business and requires care and awareness of all the necessary responsibilities in carrying out this process. Whatever the content to be taught would be, the teacher is expected to have a sense of responsibility in this direction, that is, in the direction of teaching. However, in recent years, some issues have been emphasized and discussed in international and national dimensions in many educational forums. Value teaching is among the leading subjects of these topics. This is the main reason why this topic is subjectified in this research. The effect of the teacher on attainment of students in the acquisition of values in the school environment is known. The attitudes and behaviors of teachers and teachers in this direction are at the center of educational fictions about success to be achieved in values teaching. In the researches conducted,

consistent relationships were found between the personality traits of the teacher and student behavior and learning (Akbaşlı, 2010; Erdem, Gezer & Çokadar, 2005; Memişoğlu, 2006; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990).

Students automatically learn the behavior of teachers and the values they possess (Zigler 2001). Teachers should support their students in gaining value, internalizing values, applying them to their lives, maintaining and taking responsibility in this direction. However, the way of this is through the perception of responsibility that teachers and prospective teachers acquire in value teaching as in teaching many things. It can be said that teachers, who are aware of their responsibilities in terms of attitudes and perspectives in this direction, are a very important resource in terms of training their students with awareness and sensitivity about values (Altunok Çal, 2018).

The responsibility of value teaching and the process in which this sense of responsibility is professionally formed and developed is very important in providing the success of prospective teachers who will take part in the education system in the future. However, it is constantly emphasized that the efficiency of the responsibility education to be given to prospective teachers depends on the intensiveness in the curricula, the prospective teachers' points of views of values and the frequency and quality of value education practices (Dewey, 2010; Özgan & Öztuzcu, 2016; Sürücü, 2007). Therefore, emotional education that increases the spiritual and moral development of prospective teachers should be an integral part of teacher education. Teacher training programs should ensure that teachers have the knowledge, skills and equipment they need for their emotional education (LeBlanc & Gallavan, 2009; Wong, Hon-Law & Yip, 2005).

In this regard, determining whether the prospective teachers have acquired the necessary gains regarding the sense of responsibility for teaching value during the candidacy period is also of special importance in terms of the quality of the process. No direct research on the subject has been found in the literature. However, there are studies regarding the responsibility of teachers and prospective teachers in terms of education and student success (Güvenç, 2011; Owens, 1992; Sürer ve Oral, 2015; Töremen, 2011). Therefore, considering teacher responsibility perception, which is an important factor in teaching and student success, in terms of value teaching as a current and highly emphasized subject, is thought to contribute to developing quality in the context of teaching of the subject in teacher training process and enriching the literature.

References

- Akbaşlı, S. (2010). Öğretmen yeterlilikleri hakkında ilköğretim denetçilerin görüşleri. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 39, 13-36.
- Arabacı, İ. B. (2013). Elazığ ilinde uygulanan etkinlik temelli değer öğretimi uygulamalarının değerlendirilmesi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 11(25), 7-31.
- Aremu, A. O. (2000). *Academic performance 5 factor inventory*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers.
- Asikhia, O. A. (2010). Students and teachers' perception of the causes of poor academic performance in Ogun State secondary schools [Nigeria]: Implications for counseling for national development. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 13(2), 229–242.
- Berger, J. L. & Girardet, C. (2020). Vocational teachers' classroom management style: the role of motivation to teach and sense of responsibility. *European Journal of Teacher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1764930>
- Bottery, M. (2004). Values education: Introduction. In R. Bailey, (Ed.) *Teaching values and citizenship across curriculum: Educating children for the world* (pp. 3-13). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Çavdar, M. (2009). *İlköğretim öğretmenlerinin bireysel değerlerinin çok boyutlu incelenmesi*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Coombs-Richardson, R., & Homer T. (2005). A Comparison of values rankings for selected American and Australian teachers. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4(3), 263- 277.
- Çokluk, Ö., Şekercioğlu, G., & Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2010). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Dewey, J. (2010). *Okul ve toplum*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Dilmaç, B (2007). *Bir grup fen lisesi öğrencisine verilen insani değerler eğitiminin insani değerler ölçeği ile sınanması*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Selçuk University, Konya.
- Dilmaç, B. (1999). *İnsanca değerler eğitimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.
- Erdem, A. R., Gezer, K. & Çokadar, H. (2005). Ortaöğretim fen-matematik ve sosyal alanlar öğretmenliği tezsiz yüksek lisans öğrencilerinin öğretmenlik mesleğine ilişkin tutumları. *14. Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı*, ss.471-477, Denizli.
- Güvenç, H. (2011). Öğretmen aday öğrencilerin mesleki özyeterlilik algıları ile öğrenci başarısı sorumluluk algıları. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy Education Sciences*, 6(2), 1410-142.
- Karasar, N. (2000). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi* (10th edition). Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

- Keskin, Y. (2008). *Türkiye’de sosyal bilgiler öğretim programlarında değerler eğitimi: tarihsel gelişim, 1998 ve 2004 programlarının araştırılması*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul.
- Lauermann, F. V. (2013). *Teacher responsibility: Its meaning, measure, and educational implications*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Michigan University, USA.
- Le Blanc, P. R. & Gallavan, N. P. (2009). *Affective teacher education: Exploring connections among knowledge, skills, and suppositions*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Memişoğlu, S. P. (2005). Sınıf ortamında istenmeyen davranışlara yol açan öğretmen davranışları. *Çağdaş Eğitim*, 323, 32-39.
- MEB. (2006). *İlköğretim programı*. Ankara: Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı Yayınevi.
- Merter, F. & Şekerci, H. (2015). Değerlerin kaybolma durumuna ilişkin sınıf öğretmeni görüşlerinin değerlendirilmesi. *Turkish Studies International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* Volume 10/3 Winter 2015, p. 851-874 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.7987> ISSN: 1308-2140, Ankara-Turkey
- Owens, R.C. Jr. (1992). Teacher perceptions concerning their role and the efficacy of moral education in public elementary schools. *Retrospective Theses and Dissertations*. 10146, Iowa State University.
- Özgan, H. & Öztuzcu, R. (2016). Öğretmenlerin sosyal sorumluluk temelli liderliğe ilişkin algılarının incelenmesi. *Qualitative Studies*, 11(3), 1-12.
- Pantic, N. & Wubbels, T. (2012). The role of teachers in inculcating moral values: operationalisation of concepts. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 33(1), 55-69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617672.2012.650030>
- Süer, S. & Oral, B. (2015). Determining the student teachers’ perceptions on the sense of responsibility. *International Journal of Social Science*, 32, 481-497. *Doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.9761/JASSS2704*
- Sürücü, Ö. (2007). Çocuklarda otokontrol ve sorumluluk bilinci. *Çocuk Çocuk Aylık Anne Baba Eğitimci Dergisi*, 16-17.
- Şahan, E. (2011). İlköğretim 5. ve 8. sınıf ders programlarındaki sorumluluk eğitimine dönük kazanımların gerçekleşme düzeyleri. Unpublished Master Thesis, Ahi Evran University, Kırşehir.
- Tahiroğlu, M. & Aktepe, V. (2015). Değerler eğitimi yaklaşımlarına göre geliştirilen etkinliklerin demokratik algı ve davranışlar üzerine etkisi. *Değerler Eğitimi Dergisi*, 12 (30), 309-345.
- Töremen, F. (2011). The responsibility education of teacher candidates. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*. 11(1), 273-277.
- Veugelers, W., & Vedder, P. (2003). Values in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9(4), 377-389.
- Wong P. H., Hon-Law, S. Y. A., & Yip, S. C. (2005). *Affective education: The value development of Hong Kong student-teachers*. Paper presented in Redesigning Pedagogy International Conference: Research, Policy, Practice, Singapore.
- Woolfolk, E. A. & Hoy, K. W. (1990). Prospective teachers’ sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(1), 81-91.
- Yaşar,Ş, Kasa, B. & Bayır, Ö. G. (2015). Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının görüşlerine göre değerlerin ulusal ve evrensel olarak sınıflandırılması. *Turkish Studies International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic* Volume 10/3 Winter 2015, p.

581-600 DOI Number: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.7867> ISSN: 1308-2140, Ankara-Turkey

Yeşil, R. & Aydın, D. (2007). Demokratik değerlerin eğitiminde yöntem ve zamanlama. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 11(2), 65-84.

Zigler, R. L. (2001). John Dewey, Eros, ideals, and collateral learning towards a descriptive model of exemplary teacher. philosophy of education society. *Philosophy Education Year Book*.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the Journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (**CC BY-NC-ND**) (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).